



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2015

No. 134

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

September 17, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICK W. ALLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IN MEMORY OF CAMERON PONDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Kentucky State Trooper Cameron Ponder of Rineyville, Kentucky.

I believe many people watched or saw with horror the news that spread across this country that another one of our public service officers was killed this week. Only 31 years old, Cameron was shot and killed during an on-duty traffic stop earlier this week.

Known by his peers and in the community as an athlete, Cameron was an

all-State performer in track and was the kicker on the football team in high school. After graduating from North Hardin High School near Fort Knox, Cameron joined the U.S. Navy, turning down a track scholarship.

More personally, Cameron was a son, an uncle, and a fiance. Cameron graduated from the Kentucky State Police Academy in January and had been a trooper for less than 9 months.

Among the many condolences that have been shared are those of his former Navy colleagues, who talked about his devotion to our country.

While Cameron was taken far too soon, his commitment to service and community has not gone unnoticed. I join with all of Kentucky's Second District in sending prayers to Cameron's family, friends, and his Kentucky State Police brethren. We will miss him and are thankful for his service.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when climate change was a concern for future generations, a time when we focused on predicting the possible problems and brainstorming the possible solutions, a time when the threat was real, but we still had time to act. We had not come face-to-face with our tipping point.

That time has passed. President Obama put it best when he said: "We are the first generation to feel the impacts of climate change, and the last generation that can still do something about it."

The time to act is now, and the call to action cannot be any clearer. Despite the fact that more than 12,000 peer-reviewed scientific studies are in agreement that climate change is real and humans are significantly to blame,

my colleagues continue to debate its validity. Well, if the devastating global and environmental threats aren't proof enough, let me share some of the negative impacts climate change is having on our air quality and public health now.

Simply put, climate change and air pollution make a dangerous pair. In fact, air pollution is among the most serious, indirect health effects of global climate change. The same power plants that release harmful carbon dioxide into our atmosphere also create dangerous levels of soot, smog, and ground-level ozone. The result is a combination of ozone and fine particles that can have devastating health impacts. In all, 147 million people in the U.S., nearly half of this Nation—our Nation—are breathing unhealthy air. And the news is far worse in Beijing, where a new study claims that the air in Beijing is so polluted, breathing it does as much damage to the lungs as smoking 40 cigarettes a day. That is simply unacceptable.

To make matters worse, the warmer temperatures from climate change are only increasing the frequency of days with unhealthy levels of ground-level ozone. If emissions of air pollutants remain fixed at today's levels until 2050, warming from climate change alone could increase the number of red ozone alert days by 68 percent in the 50 largest Eastern U.S. cities.

Studies have also linked breathing and ozone pollution to an increased risk of premature deaths and difficulty breathing. If there are no changes in regulatory controls, the CDC predicts up to 4,300 additional premature deaths in the United States by the year 2050 from combined ozone and particle health effects.

The good news is that air quality has improved dramatically in many American cities over the past 40 years due to the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act has a track record of cutting dangerous

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6079

pollution and has prevented more than 400,000 premature deaths. In fact, it has helped to cut ground-level ozone by more than 25 percent since 1980 and reduced mercury emissions by 45 percent since 1990. If that isn't enough, the economic value of these improvements is estimated to reach almost \$2 trillion by the year 2020.

The recently announced Clean Power Plan offers us the opportunity we need to continue to better protect public health. It is projected to contribute to significant ozone pollution reductions, resulting in important benefits including avoiding up to 3,600 premature deaths, 90,000 asthma attacks in children, and 1,700 heart attacks.

However, the continued effects of climate change and our inability to act are impairing our continued progress. Climate change is creating conditions that make it harder for us to clean up our air and reduce pollution. Without addressing one problem, we eliminate our progress on another.

Unfortunately, Members of this body use every opportunity possible to attack the Clean Air Act and now the Clean Power Plan. These unprecedented assaults block, weaken, or delay a host of long overdue clean air safeguards. As my colleagues continue to stand in our own way, we are harming the environment and ultimately hurting ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is a direct threat to humanity, and it is time we reexamine how we can think about it, talk about it, and respond to this growing problem. We may be part of the problem, but we also have the unique opportunity to become part of the solution.

I think Pope Francis put it best when he said: "Yet all is not lost. Human beings, while capable of the worst, are also capable of rising above themselves, choosing again what is good, and making a new start."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to heed these wise words and make a choice to act on climate change to protect our health. We cannot afford to wait any longer.

FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to express my deep concern and disapproval of how the Obama administration has continued their assault on Federal and private contractors.

Since taking office, the President has signed a total of 13 executive orders that directly focus on Federal contracting, all of which establish new labor requirements and impose additional financial burdens on contractors. When you also include the 16 new regulations that have been created from these orders, a large portion of contractors who were once able to compete for Federal contracts are now

being forced out due to these new hurdles.

In fact, the number of small contractors who submit bids for Federal contracts have declined by more than 100,000 since 2013. This is unacceptable. While these mandates range from forcing contractors to provide additional employee benefits to being required to report additional information during the bidding process, the one thing that each of these new directives has in common is that it will make it more difficult for small contractors to compete for Federal contracts. A prime example is the executive order known as the Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces, which the President signed in July 2014. While intended to award Federal contracts only to responsible contractors who have not committed recent labor violations, the actual outcome will lead to additional reporting requirements, increased administrative costs, and the potential for a contractor to be blacklisted from bidding on Federal contracts while they prove that they are innocent from the accused infraction.

Mr. Speaker, by using executive orders to bypass congressional authority, this is nothing more than an attempt by this administration to implement their agenda without regard for the negative impact it will have on businesses and industries. But, unfortunately, this agenda extends beyond Federal contractors. The recent National Labor Relations Board ruling in the Browning-Ferris Industries case, which is more widely known as the joint employer decision, will have a massive impact on the business relationships between contractors and their subcontractors, franchisors and franchisees, and other contract labor relations.

In one politically motivated decision, the NLRB completely redefined the definition of "joint employer" when they determined that a company could be held liable for a labor violation committed by a subcontractor or a staffing agency that they hired, even if this company doesn't have direct supervision over those workers.

This sharing of responsibility is nothing more than an attempt to force both parties into collective bargaining, but the result will be much worse. Franchisors may decide that it is in their best interest to assert more authority over their franchisees to make sure that labor violations are less likely to occur, but then other franchisors may decide it is more cost effective to end their relationship as a way to avoid potential issues. Essentially, the same results could occur with companies who hire staffing agencies or independent contractors to provide them with temporary employees or contractors who hire subcontractors to perform skilled labor.

As a small business contractor for more than two decades, I understand the unique relationship between a contractor and a subcontractor. In the

end, the joint employer decision will disrupt this relationship and potentially discourage future contract arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues to join with me in demanding this administration to stop continually adding burdens to our Federal and private contractors.

RACISM AND VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rewatched recently one of my favorite movies. "Selma" tells the story of the fight to register voters in Selma, Alabama, culminating in the march from Selma to Montgomery, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1965. Spoiler alert: After being turned around, threatened, beaten, tear-gassed, and killed, Black people got to vote in America.

A young and handsome JOHN LEWIS is depicted in the pivotal role of the community organizer who helps lead the movement. Another spoiler alert: JOHN is a Member of this body and serves with distinction from the State of Georgia.

It is among the highest honors of my life to know JOHN LEWIS and to work with him. In fact, I have marched with him and gotten arrested with JOHN LEWIS outside this Capitol Building in our fight for immigration reform.

I highly recommend the movie, and I want every citizen—and every person who lives here and hopes to become a citizen one day—to watch and learn from the movie "Selma." It is a moment in history when voting and citizenship were literally life-and-death struggles—and it was only 50 years ago.

And just yesterday, the NAACP completed a historic 1,000-mile march from Selma to Washington to remind us how we must always stand up to bullies and official inaction using nonviolence and community organizing and empowerment techniques.

The way to respond to racism is to vote. I have been thinking a lot about that recently as the Republican Presidential field of candidates has fallen in line with a bully who spews racism and is leading among his party's primary voters.

What can Americans do when the tail wagging the dog of the Republican Party is saying that most Mexicans are murderers and rapists?

What can we do as a nation when candidates blame unrest in reaction to police violence in Baltimore and Ferguson on Mexican and Central American immigrants?

What can we do when thousands of people cheer when a candidate proposes building a great wall of America on our southern border, and the response from other candidates is to say that we should build another wall opposite Canada as well?

Well, in the movie "Selma," Oprah Winfrey didn't just get mad; she fought

back by making sure she could register to vote. We have all learned what the Republican Party seems to be forgetting: Appeals to a narrow Republican electorate with over-the-top racism and below-the-belt immigrant bashing will not get you to the White House.

□ 1015

President Romney—oh, I'm sorry. Governor Romney got more White votes than any candidate in the history of the United States, but he couldn't overcome the demographic reality that the country is more diverse and so are its voters.

Appeals to racism and immigrant bashing are creating a predictable backlash in the neighborhoods of my district in Chicago. People are calling and coming into my office, asking what they can do to push back.

Very specifically, those who are not yet citizens are asking: How do I become a citizen? Those who have not registered to vote are asking how to get that done.

In Latino and Asian communities and in every community that thinks that calling most Mexicans "rapists" is not the kind of political rhetoric that should go unchallenged, people are becoming citizens.

My office in Chicago is known as a place to go if you want information on the citizenship process. In total, more than 50,000 American citizens have come to our office for help in figuring out the process.

The demand for information on citizenship has grown so much in my district that, this Saturday, from 9:00 to noon, at the Instituto Del Progreso Latino, I will join my staff and local advocates and the local office of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for a free workshop on applying to become a citizen.

Not only will people get help in understanding the process, but we will also help them figure out if they qualify for a fee waiver so that the \$680 application fee that people have to pay is not a barrier.

Think about it. There are roughly 8.8 million immigrants with green cards who have lived in the U.S. for 5 years or more or who have been married to a U.S. citizen for 3 years or more, and they can pass a background check and qualify for citizenship today.

So what I am proposing is that, instead of renewing your green card, if you are one of those 8.8 million people, and you get it for \$450 for 10 years, you apply for permanent citizenship, with a fee waiver, and become a citizen for free. That is right.

Apply for citizenship, and you can vote for whomever you want to vote for. You can even vote against the guy who called your whole ethnic group "rapists," "murderers," and "drug dealers." That kind of ugly, un-American attack is moving people to apply for citizenship and moving citizens to become voters.

Mr. Speaker, today is Citizenship Day, and there are hundreds of citizen-

ship workshops and activities across the country. I am looking forward to meeting with the hundreds of people who will be working towards their citizenship this Saturday in Chicago.

The way to respond to racism is by voting, and in Latino and immigrant communities, we are getting that message loud and clear.

OZONE REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reject a proposal from the Environmental Protection Agency that would increase compliance measures in dealing with ozone. This proposal has been met with bipartisan opposition in Pennsylvania from local, State, and, yes, Federal elected officials.

As a result of these regulations, three counties in my district—Erie, Centre, and Clearfield—would fall out of compliance with Federal law. This comes at a time when Pennsylvania's ozone emissions have declined for decades.

Let me repeat that. This comes at a time when the ozone emission levels in Pennsylvania have been in decline for decades. This is an EPA-Obama administration political solution in search of a problem.

The new regulations would trigger an implementation procedure for counties which would make State and local officials answer to the EPA for basic permitting and planning decisions.

The regulations would threaten the State's ability to open new manufacturing facilities and, by the way, the jobs that would go with that. They would threaten the State's ability to expand current businesses and invest in new roadways.

They would also threaten agriculture through restrictions on animal feeding operations due to emissions from animal waste, along with limits on pesticide use.

This proposal comes at a time when ozone emissions across Pennsylvania have been in decline, again, for decades. With the State's economy still on the rebound from the Great Recession, now is the wrong time for new, stringent, and, I would argue, unnecessary rules from the EPA that could kill jobs.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this proposal is the latest in a series of overreaches by the EPA, including the Clean Power Plan, which was announced earlier this summer by President Obama.

That plan will work hand in hand with these proposed ozone limits to kill good-paying jobs and to stifle economic development in Pennsylvania and across the Nation.

Furthermore, recent studies have called into question the claim that ozone levels lead to health issues, in-

cluding asthma, especially among children.

With that in mind, these proposed regulations, which could be the costliest in the history of this Nation, may not have any impact on the health of our citizens.

There is still time for the EPA to reconsider the stringent regulation proposals for ozone and coal power plants.

As the Representative of a largely rural district which depends on agriculture, I understand how important it is that we be good stewards of the environment.

However, that stewardship must be balanced with the protection of industries and jobs, which have powered our communities for generations.

DROUGHT AND WILDFIRES IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the devastating wildfires that are sweeping throughout the Western States and, particularly, in much of California.

Last week, we had over 22 wildfires at one time that were in various parts of California. Because of the incredible 4 consecutive dry years, what once was a seasonal issue now seems to be year round.

Obviously, the drought conditions facing California played a big role in the ability to manage these wildfires, and the devastation that has occurred as a result of that has been great.

These last 4 years have been among the driest 4 years we have had, climatologists say, in 1,200 years in California and in the Western States.

Over 70 percent of California is facing what is considered to be extreme and exceptional drought conditions, which are among the highest categories that you can face under drought conditions.

California is not new to managing wildfires. It is part of living in that State as well as in other Western States, but these dry conditions over the last 4 years have made it worse; therefore, we need to try to figure out different ways to address this.

The Rough fire in Fresno County, which is part of the county I represent, has burned over 140,000 acres. Yesterday, finally, we got up to 67 percent contained.

This fire has lasted over a month, and it has closed one of our great national parks, Kings Canyon National Park. Last week, when I was home, literally, ashes were raining on our communities. Governor Jerry Brown has announced a state of emergency for northern California.

The Valley and Butte fires have been significant, affecting both Congressman MCCLINTOCK's and Congressman THOMPSON's districts.

Congressman THOMPSON has lost over 600 homes, and the fires are threatening thousands more. He has stayed

there to protect his district and assist with the fires. At this point, the Valley fire is only 30 percent contained. The Butte fire has taken 233 homes.

As a result of these devastating fires, sadly, two firefighters have lost their lives, three civilians have been killed, and four firefighters have been hospitalized due to receiving severe burns. Literally, we have thousands and thousands of men and women who are out there manning these fires.

So the question is: What should we do about it as these numbers, sadly, continue to rise?

We need to better manage our forests. We need to help alleviate and cut down on the fuel that is there through the brush that has made these fires spread incredibly fast in conditions that were never foretold. Wildfire suppression and better managing our forests is a key to doing this.

The funding that we provide for natural disasters, like to FEMA for hurricanes and for earthquakes, ought to go toward putting out these fires.

We have exceeded over \$1 billion in the U.S. Forestry Department's budget, and we have completely overrun our ability to provide funding.

Currently, money the U.S. Forest Service has allocated for forest cleanup in order to prevent fires is being used to put the fires out.

We must put our political differences aside and pass legislation that will alleviate this crisis in Western States and in California.

In addition to getting legislation passed that will provide funding for putting fires out, we need to put legislation together that would, in fact, in the future, manage our forests better.

In July, I, along with Congressman VALADAO, introduced legislation, the Western Water and American Food Security Act.

This is part of a larger effort to deal with this issue. This legislation is the first step toward passing a bill that will provide additional tools for California to manage drought. This bill addresses a number of solutions to fix California's broken water system.

They include improved operations that are governed by the latest science, which will allow us to move more water when water is available in the system; additional water storage capacity; increased water recycling and reuse; improved water efficiency; and a conveyance solution that minimizes the use of an ecosystem as infrastructure and that balances the water needs for all of California.

This is but one of the tools that we need to address. We have legislation in the House, and we have legislation in the Senate. This fall, I hope we will be able to work together in a bipartisan fashion to pass this important legislation.

Certainly, these wildfires tell the public—and the public tells us—that we must do something about this. It must be a priority that we get something signed into law this year, before the

rainy and snowy seasons begin. Lord knows, we hope it rains and snows this winter.

People in California, people in our valley, which has been ground zero for the drought impacts, and people in the West want Congress to act.

I urge my colleagues to take the appropriate action and pass much necessary legislation affecting the drought conditions in California and in the Western States.

DAVID C. HYDE, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, throughout our lives here on Earth, God places in our path certain people who influence our lives, who help shape who we are, and who ultimately help us to understand our purpose.

A couple of years ago, I met someone whose optimism, faith, and valor in the face of difficulty has had a great influence on me, on my family, and on our entire community.

I met Mr. David Hyde in 2013, who at that time was a small business owner in Cartersville, Georgia. At that time, I was a relatively unknown candidate for Congress, who was promoting the idea that America's days are still ahead of us if we define where we are going and aggressively set a course to get there. David quickly became a supporter and a friend.

Although many had lost hope in restoring America's greatness, David was a breath of fresh air. His patriotism was inspiring; his optimism was infectious; and his energy invigorated me with a willingness to fight on.

David and I share a vision: to restore our struggling Nation to one that is free, safe, and full of opportunity. We both believe that we can turn the tide and give our grandchildren a nation better than the one we inherited, but, of course, it will take a lot of hard work.

Within 2 weeks of our introduction, David was given the news that he had esophageal cancer and that it was rapidly spreading. Now, after nearly 2 years of, quite literally, putting up the fight of his life, the cancer is quickly taking David's life. The time my friend has left with his wife and children is no longer measured in months or weeks, but in days.

In realizing that any day could be David's last, I recently asked: David, if you had the ability to speak to the American people, what would you say?

Mr. Speaker, in response to that question, David sent me the following words of encouragement to give to the people of this great Nation. David wrote:

I recently had the honor of going to lunch with a friend just days before he shipped off to join the Navy.

As we sat enjoying our meal, I saw in the eyes of my friend a young man who was

proud to be given the opportunity to serve his country.

The more we talked, the more he reminded me of another young man who, 35 years earlier, had also left home and family to join the Navy. The similarities between the two of us were not lost on me, and it reminded me of all that America held for a young man like me back then.

While my vision of sailing the high seas and protecting the land of the free may have been somewhat jaded by the old black and white movies I grew up watching, the dream of doing something that really mattered was alive and real to me. While America may have gotten off course, the goal of why we served has never changed.

We have lost many of the freedoms we once held, but I believe we are not so far from those days that, with hard work, sacrifice, and turning our eyes back to God, they cannot be restored.

My life is a living example of God's restoration powers.

It doesn't appear God will heal my sick body, but I know that, in the land I am soon going to enter, I have already been granted a new body—a perfect one—which I will have for eternity. That, my friends, is restoration.

Just as He will restore me, I believe He can restore our Nation to the greatness it once saw, but it will only be possible if we turn our affections back to Him. The road to restoration is not easy, as I can personally attest. It is hard, painful, and discomfiting. But when your eyes are upon God, not your problems, the path is much easier to endure.

□ 1030

He has set out a clear plan with guidelines that aren't hard to follow. As our Founders understood, we may have some battles to overcome and a wilderness to cross, but we must not be paralyzed by fear of the unknown, for it is "In God We Trust."

When leading the Israelites from bondage, Moses had to lift his rod over the Red Sea in complete trust before God parted the waters for safe passage. He trusted God and forged on.

Although he faced insurmountable odds, the fear of the unknown didn't stop Joshua from forging on.

During the darkest hours of the American Revolution at Valley Forge, Washington didn't give up, but dug in and put his faith in the providence of God.

Leaders who are willing to do what is difficult or even what seems to be impossible are the ones who carry the team forward.

We must honor God and know that his plans for us include only one thing, His glory. If we are in it for Him, we win. If we are in it for ourselves, we lose.

Just as my young friend went out to serve in the U.S. Navy without a clearly defined path or step-by-step guidelines, but fully relying on his authorities to lead him, we must know that, if we are to return to our country's traditional values, we need to study our history, find men and women willing to adhere to those founding principles, and tighten ourselves for a brighter future led by our intelligently chosen authorities.

Who is your leader?

My best advice, as a man looking backwards with 20/20 vision, is to decide now whom you will serve and proceed in a manner worthy of your calling.

David C. Hyde, Jr.

Thank you, David, for these words of inspiration and hope. God bless you, my friend, as you forge ahead in faith and trust in God almighty.

NO SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have 6 legislative days until the Government of the United States shuts down for lack of funding.

Why? It is because the Republican leadership here in the House has failed to bring forth critical appropriations bills to fund the government. As a result of that, we are faced with the need to pass a continuing resolution to fund the government; yet we have leading Members of the Congress here threatening to shut down the government rather than to put forth on the House of Representatives here a bipartisan bill for a continuing resolution to fund the government.

Instead, we have partisan after partisan after partisan legislative measures brought before the House here under closed rules that the leadership knows isn't going to go anywhere, but it is introduced for the perceived notion of partisan gain.

The hard simple truth is that the American people want the Congress to put their partisanship aside and to go to work, start fixing things, finding common ground, rebuilding the middle class, creating jobs, and restoring the American Dream. They surely don't want another government shutdown that puts people's jobs, families, our government, and our national security at risk.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Congress of the United States needs to come to Washington and to go to work. If the Congress doesn't do its job and get its work done, then Congress shouldn't get paid. The working men and women of America don't get paid when they don't come to work, why should the Congress get paid?

That is why I have introduced the No Government No Pay Act to prohibit Members of Congress from getting paid during a shutdown of the Congress' own creation—because people in this country, they don't want a shutdown.

They want to see the Congress go to work, find common ground, fix things, get things done, rebuild America with a transportation bill, not another kick-the-can-down-the-road, short-term fix. They want jobs with good-paying benefits, not a Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement that sends their good-paying jobs overseas.

The American people want accessible health care for our veterans, as indeed they should be receiving, not a trip to "kingdom come" every time a veteran needs some medical care.

The American people, they want to see protection from Social Security and for Medicare and the recognition these are not entitlements, that these are benefits that people worked hard for and started paying for the first day that they ever went to work. They surely don't want to see those benefits

turned over to Wall Street and to the big insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if the Congress doesn't go to work, it shouldn't get paid.

More importantly, the Congress needs to go to work and bring these measures under open rules before the full House of Congress because that is how you find common ground, that is how you get things done, that is how you fix things in America.

The American people want it; they deserve it, and they have every right to expect it.

PROTECTING LIFE BY DEFUNDING
PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, like the majority of the American people, I was disgusted and angered by the recent videos showing Planned Parenthood officials apparently willing to sell the tissues and organs of aborted babies. That is right; I said "babies," not a glob of tissue as some would suggest.

I have always been unapologetically pro-life, and the mere thought of such horrific actions is beyond words. That is why I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to support the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, which will cut all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood until the House conducts a complete and full investigation into the organization's abortion practices.

I am also pleased that this legislation will reallocate Federal funds currently being used to fund Planned Parenthood's abortion services to community health centers and other clinics that help provide preventative care to women without performing abortions.

Women's health is extremely important, and it is my belief that the funding currently being used to fund Planned Parenthood's abortion agenda will be better used by helping our local clinics provide vital women's health services without promoting the malicious practice of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the majority of my constituents in the Third Congressional District of West Virginia want to see a culture of life promoted in Washington, not a culture of barbarity and lack of respect of life.

My constituents deserve to know that their taxpayer dollars are going to organizations that represent their values and beliefs, not to organizations that are determined to push their own agenda that goes against the will of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 and to promote the sanctity of life and listen to the American people and my constituents when they say they have had enough of their hard-earned tax dollars being spent to pro-

mote Planned Parenthood's pro-abortion agenda.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a very important issue that continues to trouble the American people, and that is the Republican obsession of denying a woman and families' access to certain healthcare services like birth control.

Republicans' outdated views on family planning do nothing to empower women and nothing for families in their success in the 21st century. The latest round in the Republicans' battle against women's access to health care is, yet again, an attempt to eliminate Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

This debate has been riddled with lies and deliberate misinformation designed to shock the American people, while needlessly demonizing one of the Nation's leading women's healthcare providers.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we talk about a few things and clear up some issues and talk about the facts in this. Since its inception, Planned Parenthood has empowered millions of women nationwide by providing affordable access to contraception. Cutting off funding would cripple Planned Parenthood's ability to provide this crucial service for our Nation's women.

The two primary sources of Federal funding for Planned Parenthood come from two programs, Medicaid and Title X Family Planning. These programs were created as a safety net to provide low-income individuals with access to critical medical services that they would otherwise be forced to forego due to their high cost, such as birth control.

Together, these programs account for over 40 percent of Planned Parenthood's operating budget. Stripping these dollars would severely decrease Planned Parenthood's ability to provide care for 2.7 million people that they serve every year.

Let me tell you what this means. This means millions of the Nation's poor women would not only be at risk of losing affordable contraceptive services and counseling, but also their access to breast and cervical cancer screenings, as well as testing and treatment for STDs.

It is important to understand that, for those who are uninsured, this is the only way to get this lifesaving care. This would mean 400,000 fewer pap smears for women, 500,000 fewer breast exams, and 4.5 million fewer STD tests and treatments nationwide.

Let me be clear. It is not just Democrats' districts that will be affected. If you go outside of the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex, these smaller cities and suburban areas and rural areas, those are Republican districts; they

have low-income women, and they will be cut off from this funding and this treatment.

All this is at risk because of Republicans' objections to Planned Parenthood providing safe and legal access to abortions. This is less than 3 percent of what this organization does. In accordance with Federal law, no Federal funds go to cover abortion services.

Another faulty argument made by Republicans is that the Nation's community healthcare centers could absorb the work that Planned Parenthood currently does.

I love community health centers, and I appreciate the work that they do because they really do serve the underserved, but the idea that these facilities would be able to provide adequate services to nearly 3 million additional people who would suddenly be without care is simply unimaginable.

Community health centers rely on other sources for affordable care to alleviate the strains of residents' needs, sources like Planned Parenthood. This is not imagined. I have seen it in the State of Texas.

I have visited community healthcare centers in the district that I serve, and they are very overwhelmed as a result of the void for healthcare services purposely created by the Republican State legislature. One of the things you always hear Republicans hollering about is how much they want to save taxpayers money.

Let me tell you something. What happened in my State of Texas in 2012, Governor Rick Perry and the Republican State legislature banned Planned Parenthood from participating in the Medicaid Women's Health Program, a joint initiative that saved Texas millions of dollars in Medicaid prenatal and delivery costs through the prevention of unplanned pregnancies.

Today, 30,000 fewer women are receiving that care, Medicaid claims are down by 26 percent, and Texas taxpayers are now paying the full price to support the State's community health centers. Republicans wasted lots of money.

Where does that leave us today? I will tell you a lot of these antiabortion groups and their political allies have created this partisan debate by releasing a series of deceitfully edited "undercover" videos casting Planned Parenthood in a negative light.

Let me tell you that these videos are a sham; they are lies, and they do absolutely nothing to help increase access to the critical services that Planned Parenthood provides for women.

Documents and testimony submitted to the Energy and Commerce Committee during a wasteful and unnecessary investigation show that absolutely no evidence exists to substantiate claims that Planned Parenthood violated the law in any way. In fact, their fetal tissue donation program is not only compliant with Federal law, but goes well beyond the law's requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to cease their fruitless fight against birth control—because we know that this is really what this is all about—and Planned Parenthood and women's health and get to the job of governing.

We all want women to have access to the health care they need to stay healthy for their family because, let me tell you, in my family and in families around the country, that if mom is not healthy, the rest of the family is not healthy.

That is why I choose to put people before politics and stand with women, families, and all the people of Texas and America in my support of Planned Parenthood.

□ 1045

OUR STRATEGY AGAINST ISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this month, the President of the United States addressed the Nation proposing his strategy for a war against ISIS. He struggled with what the mission was. Were we as a nation engaging to degrade ISIS, to defeat ISIS, to destroy ISIS? And then the question arose in this body, at what level do we engage? Do we consider an Authorization for Use of Military Force, something that is proper under our constitutional authority?

Yet 1 year later, we have not considered an Authorization for Use of Military Force. We have not had the debate over what is the role of this body and our current foreign policy and our current national security strategy against ISIS. The only portion that we were willing to touch was the request to arm and train Syrian rebels; and this body, I believe wrongfully, authorized and appropriated half a billion dollars—\$500 million—to train Syrian rebels. Yesterday, we heard from the top commander of our forces in the Middle East that there are either four or five individuals engaged as Syrian rebels confronting ISIS—\$500 million, five people.

The President's strategy against ISIS has failed. ISIS continues to grow geographically, continues to be enriched. Russia's hand is strengthened. Iran has increasing leverage every single day. Mr. Speaker, the architects of terror today are emboldened. But they are emboldened not only by the failure of this administration's policy; they are emboldened by the failure of this Congress to do our job.

Where are we in this debate? Where is this Congress on whether or not we are going to consider an Authorization for Use of Military Force? Where are we today on the \$500 million that has now trained five people? Do we stand behind that decision as a body? I hope we do not.

The bigger question we have to ask, and it is a hard question: Are we a na-

tion at war today with ISIS or are we not? If we are, are we willing as a nation to accept the human and economic consequences that come with conflict?

The frustration you hear in my voice is the frustration we hear in the voices of the American people across the Nation every single day. It is a frustration about what this body does not do. We should be having a debate over the Authorization for Use of Military Force. I don't know how that debate turns out.

Nobody wants to go into conflict. We don't get to choose the threats that come our way. We only choose our response, and 1 year later we have no response. All this is through the lens of an agenda that we continue to fail to do.

Let's give voice to the American people on issues like border security and immigration reform, on transportation, on a budget that finally balances. The frustration is not that we haven't achieved these things; it is that we haven't even engaged in a legislative fight to begin to advance the agenda that is right for the American people.

We are elected to be custodians of the public trust, and we fail that public trust every day we fail to consider the issues that are of most significance to the American people, to honor the constitutional responsibility we have under article I. We have spent the last 2 years cloaking ourselves in the article I authority of the Congress every time the President overreaches, and we have rightfully done so; but just as we cloak ourselves in the article I authority, we have to recognize article I brings responsibility.

We have failed to honor the responsibility that we have under article I. We have an obligation to have a very hard debate about whether or not we are a nation at war with ISIS and whether or not we are doing anything in the face of the President's failed policy to actually confront the audible threat of terror of a regime that wishes to bring harm and destroy the United States of America. This body has failed to engage in that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask with the utmost conviction of this Member but, frankly, the people who give me the honor to represent them in this House. Let's give voice to the American people. Let's give voice to the people that we represent here in this body, and let's finally have that debate.

WE CANNOT STAND IDLY BY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce the unjust sentence of almost 14 years that was handed to human rights activist Leopoldo Lopez in Venezuela. Leopoldo is pictured here in this poster with his slogan, which says, "Wanting a better

Venezuela is not a crime." Liberate Leopoldo.

Sentenced along with Leopoldo as human rights activists were Cristian Holdack, Angel Gonzalez, and Demian Martin, three students whose charge sheets include public instigation, damages to property, and arson—all false charges. Their crimes were nothing more than standing up to the regime—the corrupt, illegitimate regime—of Nicolas Maduro in Venezuela and demanding a better country that would have respect for human rights, that would have freedom of the press, and that would have free and fair elections and other universally recognized rights.

As this says, demanding a better Venezuela is not a crime, except it is in Venezuela. Democracy advocates are harassed; they are abused; they are imprisoned; they are beaten; and some are even killed—yes, killed. We cannot stand idly by while democracy and due process are trampled on in our own hemisphere.

Democracies like Brazil, Mexico, Colombia, and Chile should join the U.S. in advocating for democracy and stability for Venezuela, and freedom for the many political prisoners who are languishing in Maduro's gulags. I urge the Obama administration to immediately sanction the judge, prosecutors, and those who led this politically motivated kangaroo court against Leopoldo Lopez, against these students, and against so many.

The President can use the power granted to the executive branch when we passed here in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the United States Senate the Venezuelan sanctions legislation last year. The President must act. Mr. Speaker, let's hope that he does.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to denounce so many human rights violations that are occurring throughout the hemisphere, whether it is in Venezuela or my native homeland of Cuba. As the Pope prepares for his historic trip to Cuba this weekend, he should meet with those people, like the political prisoners who share common interests of peace and justice with the Catholic Church. The church stands for liberty; it defends the freedoms of oppressed people, the freedoms to pursue one's goals and dreams without having to live in fear.

The Castro regime stands for the complete opposite. It stands for oppression, for violence, for hatred, for injustice, and I would urge His Holiness to meet with those who truly defend the values for which the church stands; people like this young man, a graffiti artist, a young man who has only known Communist Cuba as his government. His name is El Sexto. It means the sixth one, in reference to some other charges.

El Sexto has been behind bars for nearly 9 months. He has been on a hunger strike to protest the brutal Castro regime. What did he do? This is what he did. He had a picture of two farm

animals, and he put the names of Fidel and Raul on them. For that, he has been imprisoned with no contact with the outside world.

In January, another young man, a Cuban rapper named El Dkano, was sentenced to a year in prison just because he used music to criticize the Castro regime, a regime which has not unclenched its fist against the Cuban people.

Yesterday, pro-democracy leader Jorge Luis Garcia Perez, also known as Antunez, and 10 of his activists of the organization National Civic Resistance Front announced that they have begun a fast in an attempt to get a meeting with His Holiness to raise the plight of the suffering Cuban people.

These are just a few of the prisoners, Mr. Speaker, who have received harsh sentences after President Obama signed and announced this ill-fated deal with the Castro regime on December 17.

Reports indicate that the Castro regime is planning on releasing more than 3,000 prisoners in advance of the Pope's visit to Cuba, and you will think, hey, that sounds like a good idea, but let's remember this: Many of those prisoners should have never been in jail in the first place. By the way, political prisoners like El Sexto, for doing an artwork, will not be included in that number. No political prisoners will be freed, but that is not anything new, Mr. Speaker.

In 1978, Fidel Castro released almost 3,800 political prisoners ahead of Jimmy Carter's visit; in 1998, Fidel Castro released 300 prisoners ahead of Pope John Paul's visit; in the year 2011, Raul Castro released nearly 3,100 ahead of Pope Benedict's visit; yet the Castro regime has detained an unprecedented number of Cubans this year. With all of these people being freed, this year, there has been an unprecedented number of arrests in Cuba of political activists.

We can be sure that before the Pope's visit, during the Pope's visit, and after the Pope's visit, more innocent Cubans will be detained—like El Sexto—by the regime and thrown into Castro's gulags. This tactic is nothing new, and it is not indicative of a change of policy by the evil, despotic, sadistic Castro regime. It is just a political propaganda farce.

Will the Pope see this cynical move for what it is? We shall soon see, Mr. Speaker.

INVESTIGATIONS INTO PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to speak about the investigations into Planned Parenthood and to the sale of fetal tissues. We are beginning this process in our Committee on Energy and Commerce;

and we are approaching this in a thoughtful manner, beginning these investigations as we look at life rights and focus on the lives of these unborn children and the mothers who have gone through this process.

It is so interesting to me, as we have this discussion of fetal tissue sales and what all has transpired in the selling of these tissues, that we look to science. What science has shown us is that these are not blobs of tissue; these are babies.

This weekend, I had the opportunity to go to a baby shower, and a very excited grandmother showed me the sonogram, the picture of her unborn granddaughter already named and being celebrated. As we looked at it, we could distinguish these features of this child yet unborn, but this child fully formed and developing and sleeping in her mother's womb.

There was great excitement to celebrate this arrival, and we know that this is a fight worth having and a process worth ending as we look at the selling of these fetal organs and what has transpired.

Now, everyone is familiar with what happened with Kermit Gosnell in his house of horrors, and we know there was a conviction, but what we have learned is those convictions are very rare. We have moved now to the video footage that The Center for Medical Progress released, and we see that this is absolutely sickening, abhorrent.

□ 1100

These videos have raised a lot of suspicion about what has transpired in these Planned Parenthood affiliates and clinics and questions as to whether they have systematically and repeatedly broken laws.

Obtaining informed consent for fetal tissue donation, how was that approached? Killing infants born alive after an attempted induced abortion, who are the persons entitled to legal protection here?

As you look at a botched abortion and you have a child born alive, all of a sudden you have got two patients there that you are considering.

Dr. Deborah Nucatola, Senior Director of Medical Services for Planned Parenthood Federation of America, describes harvesting human tissues. In one of the videos, she talks about crushing this part or the other part of the baby in order to get a good specimen.

To listen to her callous description and her casual manner is sickening, but it also may violate some of the Federal laws which prohibit alteration of abortion procedures to obtain fetal tissue.

In another video, a technician says:

I'm sitting here and I'm looking at this fetus, and its heart is beating, and I don't know what to think. I don't know if that constitutes it's technically dead or it's alive.

Imagine that. This baby, if it had arrived in a hospital with a NICU and doctors surrounding it, there would

have been a rush to make certain that life was saved.

And God bless those NICU specialists who work with these preemie babies. We have all spent time with them and are grateful that they are there.

The cheap veneer of the left, the defense of abortion as a matter of reproductive choice, is wearing thin. Reproductive rights?

As I said, let's talk about life rights. Let's discuss life rights. It is Constitution Day, the right to life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

We have got several bills that our Members are bringing forward, which I will submit for the RECORD, along, Mr. Speaker, with those Democrats that voted for the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, which was passed in this House by a voice vote.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD BILLS

H.R. 3134, THE DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015 (BLACK)

Bill would impose a one-year moratorium on all federal funding to Planned Parenthood or any of its affiliates while investigations are conducted unless they certify they will not perform abortions or provide funds to other entities that perform abortions.

Restriction does not apply in cases of rape, incest or woman's health concerns.

H.R. 3429, THE PROHIBITING THE LIFE-ENDING INDUSTRY OF FETAL ORGAN EXCHANGE ACT OR THE PRO-LIFE ACT (YODER)

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act to prohibit the transfer of fetal tissue in exchange for valuable consideration, including payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue.

H.R. 3494, THE PROTECTING INFANTS BORN ALIVE ACT (BLACKBURN)

Draft legislation I have authored to strengthen and improve the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002.

The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 became law on August 5, 2002 and requires that any reference to person, human being, child or individual include every infant born alive.

Both Ellmers and Blackburn bills will ban any provider proven of violating either of these existing laws from participating in Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP and will allow states that suspect any violation of these existing laws to ban those suspected from the state's Medicaid program.

H.R. 3495, THE WOMEN'S PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT (DUFFY)

The bill amends the Medicaid law to allow states the flexibility and discretion to be able to exclude abortion providers like Planned Parenthood from Medicaid. States that have tried to defund Planned Parenthood have been blocked by the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services assertion that states must fund Planned Parenthood under what is known as the "free choice of qualified provider" provision in Medicaid. Since the release of the undercover videos by Center for Medical Progress three states (Louisiana, Alabama and Arkansas) have sought to terminate Planned Parenthood's Medicaid contracts and are now embroiled in lawsuits.

H.R. 3504, THE BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT (FRANKS)

Bill mandates that infants born alive during abortions are legal persons entitled to all the rights and protections allowed to other

legal persons, including needed medical care and attention. This legislation requires the same care for a child born alive during an abortion as a naturally premature baby born in a hospital. Any violation to this rule is a federal offense and must immediately be reported to law enforcement.

The bill also provides for criminal penalties for providers who fail to provide care to baby.

H.R. XX, THE PROTECT INFANTS FROM PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION ACT (ELLMERS)

Legislation will bolster the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003.

The Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 amends the Federal Criminal code to ban partial-birth abortions except in the interest of the life of the mother

H.R. 3515, SMITH DISMEMBERMENT ABORTION BAN ACT

The Born Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-207) passed the House by voice vote and the Senate by UC. The following is a list of Democrats who were serving when these votes took place.

DEMOCRATIC SENATORS

Tammy Baldwin*, Barbara Boxer, Sherrod Brown*, Benjamin L. Cardin*, Maria Cantwell, Tom Carper, Dick Durbin, Dianne Feinstein, Patrick Leahy, Edward J. Markey*, Robert Menendez*, Barbara Mikulski, Patty Murray, Bill Nelson (FL), Jack Reed, Harry Reid, Chuck Schumer, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Udall (NM)*, Ron Wyden.

*served in the House during the 107th Congress.

DEMOCRATIC HOUSE MEMBERS

Xavier Becerra, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Earl Blumenauer, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, James E. Clyburn, John Conyers Jr., Joseph Crowley, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo.

Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Gene Green, Luis V. Guterrez, Alcee L. Hastings, Rubén Hinojosa, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Steve Israel, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Marcy Kaptur, Ron Kind, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Nita M. Lowey, Stephen F. Lynch.

Betty McCollum, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Carolyn B. Maloney, Gregory W. Meeks, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Frank Pallone Jr., Bill Pascrell Jr., Donald M. Payne, Nancy Pelosi, Collin C. Peterson, David E. Price, Charles B. Rangel, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Bobby L. Rush, Loretta Sanchez, Janice D. Schakowsky.

Adam B. Schiff, Robert C. Scott, José E. Serrano, Brad Sherman, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Maxine Waters.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Brondon Reems, Center of Hope Community Church, Oakland, California, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the Earth. We honor You. We beseech thee in behalf of these, our United States and Congress.

Heavenly Father, we depend on You for skillful and Godly wisdom, to enter into the hearts and minds of those in authority. Only You know the rightness of their cause, their purpose, and their plans.

To thee, do they now look up, realizing that their help comes from You. They look to You for Your approval and for Your support. They look to You for favor that only You can give.

We thank You, Heavenly Father, for Your mercy as we seek peace in all of these United States and the world. We give thanks for the leaders You have given to us. We thank You for Your love and protection that surrounds them.

We ask that You continue to bless, strengthen, and preserve those they represent. We believe in Your Word that declares blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARRETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND BRONDON REEMS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to welcome Pastor Brondon Reems to the House floor this morning after delivering such a powerful prayer.

Pastor Reems is the senior pastor of the Center of Hope Community Church in Oakland, California, a church founded by his mother—a great woman of faith, who has broken so many glass ceilings for women, especially for African American women—Bishop Ernestine Reems.

His wife, Pastor Maria, who is also here with us today, is his partner in

ministry and has helped to grow the church into a vibrant and strong pillar of faith and community in the East Bay.

Pastor Reems accepted his call to ministry at 10 years old, and he has flourished into a strong spiritual leader.

From ministering youth in juvenile hall to assisting families coping with substance abuse and emotional disabilities, Pastor Reems serves the East Bay community with a genuine heart and compassion.

He is the cofounder of the Oakland's Potters House for Young Men, a 24-hour residential care facility for young teens who have become wards of the State.

I thank Pastor Reems for his spiritual leadership, his wisdom, and his service. He embodies and exemplifies a living faith. He is a wonderful pastor, a great mentor, and a committed and powerful civic leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZINKE). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, as founder of the Congressional Constitution Caucus, today marks the 228th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution.

Unlike other revolutions, the Constitution was not imposed on the people. It was submitted to the people for their approval. If the people were to judge the Constitution, they were expected to understand the Constitution.

The Federalist Papers, a series of essays written by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison, argued for ratification and served as an invaluable guide to the Constitution. Education was integral to the Constitution's success.

Today, I commend all those who follow in the footsteps of our Founders by accepting the duty to educate the public on the ideals of human liberty. It is they we must thank for the preservation of the Constitution today.

NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP DAY

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate National Citizenship Day.

America would not be the great country that it is without its immigrants. One of our greatest strengths is our Nation's diversity—the ability of this country to absorb and integrate the

most entrepreneurial minds that this world has to offer and to make them our own. In fact, immigrants or their children have founded more than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies.

However, there is a dangerous anti-immigrant sentiment perpetuated by those who fail to recognize the strength derived from our diversity. Even today, laws are being proposed to deny the constitutional right of citizenship to those born in America. Proposals like these are both appalling and un-American.

In Congress, we must continue to fight against these anti-immigrant proposals and to push for comprehensive immigration reform, and we must work to ensure that every person who is eligible for naturalization understands the process that it takes to become a U.S. citizen and has a voice in our great democracy.

CONGRATULATING JEFF HERRALA

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Jeff Herrala of Andover for being named the 2015 Cadet of the Year.

Jeff graduated first in his class from Anoka High School, where he excelled in both academics and athletics.

Due to Jeff's stellar accomplishments both inside the classroom and out, my predecessor, Michele Bachmann, awarded Jeff with both the Congressional Certificate of Merit and an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in 2012.

Jeff currently attends the Air Force Academy in Colorado, where he is studying aeronautical engineering.

It is clear that Jeff truly embodies one of the Air Force's core values: excellence. Throughout Jeff's life and academic career, he has demonstrated nothing short of excellence, and he is beyond deserving of this award.

Jeff, I am proud to recognize you here today, and I look forward to seeing what the future has in store for you.

INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans are on Capitol Hill today to attend the Rally for Medical Research and to demand increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

The NIH supports 400,000 American jobs. In fact, 82 percent of its budget supports research conducted in every State in this Nation, and every dollar of NIH funding generates \$2.21 in local economic activity.

The effects are, obviously, not only economic. Thanks in large part to the National Institutes of Health, deaths

from heart disease are down 50 percent over the last 40 years, deaths from cancer are down 20 percent since 1991, and the cure rate for childhood cancer is now 80 percent.

From 1997 to 2003, Congress doubled funding for the National Institutes of Health, but, since then, it has fallen by 25 percent when accounting for inflation.

Just yesterday, the National Cancer Institute released a report that identifies research that won't be conducted unless Congress restores its purchasing power with sustained annual funding increases over the next decade. We must not let that happen.

I urge this House to give the NIH the resources it needs to conduct the work our Nation deserves.

SERVING OUR SAVIOR

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, during the August work period, Smith Phillips Building Supply hosted a customer appreciation day and supplier showcase that I attended in Winston-Salem.

While I was there, I had the pleasure of speaking with Jack Shearin, who founded a ministry called Serving our Savior, and Harry Underwood, who chairs the ministry.

Since 2000, this group has been assisting the disabled in Forsyth County by building handicap ramps at their homes. All the work is performed by volunteers, who build 70 to 80 ramps each year.

Since the organization's inception, more than 700 ramps have been built. Serving our Savior does not charge for their ramps. Instead, the organization allows the recipients to pay what they can, and if they are unable to pay, funds are provided by Serving our Savior.

This ministry is a wonderful example of the difference a small group of people can make in its local community, and I applaud their selfless work on behalf of those who need a helping hand.

CONFECTIONERS

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that says you can catch a lot more bees with honey than with vinegar. It turns out that that is true in business, too.

The confectioners industry employs a whopping 55,000 busy worker bees in the United States—that is 55,000 people who are working directly in the confectionery industry—and indirectly supports another 400,000 jobs in other industries from retail to trucking.

Every confectionery job created in the United States supports another seven; but Congress continues to maintain an unbelievably wrongheaded policy that is destroying these jobs.

The Department of Commerce found that protectionist provisions in the 2008 farm bill destroyed three jobs for every job they saved. They have cost consumers and businesses as much as \$14 billion since 2008, and they have cost taxpayers over \$300 million in subsidies.

We have lost over 125,000 jobs in sugar-related industries since 1997. We cannot continue to hurt our own workers and consumers alike. This is not a sugar high. This is a sugar low.

I urge Congress to pass the bipartisan Sugar Reform Act so we can provide relief to small- and medium-sized businesses.

CHUCK HAUPTMAN

(Mr. ZINKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZINKE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a Billings resident, a World War II veteran, and a fabled member of the Army 10th Mountain Division K Company, Chuck Hauptman.

Seventy years ago, the young lieutenant was crawling on his belly up Mount Belvedere under the cover of darkness. The K Company was charged with leading the allied assault on the Germans through the minefields—set up along the steepest peak—and driving the Germans out of Italy.

On one February night, they battled snow, darkness, vertical climbs, freezing temperatures, and booby traps, all while under the heavy machine gun fire of the Nazis.

The K Company was in combat for 110 days against Nazi forces in the Italian Alps. During this time, Lieutenant Hauptman was shot and wounded in battle while assaulting a machine gun nest. Like many young men, he went back to battle.

It is easy to forget the young men who were sent to the battle in World War II. We look at our veterans and the aging today of our World War II veterans.

Remember, as our young men go to battle, that our Nation asks our youngest men and women to go to battle and fight for this country, and we should never forget the sacrifice.

When we go to war, we send our Nation's best. I am proud to recognize Chuck Hauptman as one of our Nation's best. He represents the best of Montana, the best of our country, and the best of our youth.

□ 1215

5,000 ROLE MODELS OF EXCELLENCE PROJECT

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, almost a half century ago, while serving as an elementary school principal in Miami, I sensed a void in

the lives of the boys who were always being sent to my office because of disruptive behavior.

The one thing they all had in common was the lack of an adult male to love them and guide them along life's often tricky paths. I founded the 5,000 Role Models of Excellence Project to rescue these boys of color from futures fueled by drugs, poverty, or prison.

The 5,000 Role Models of Excellence is recognized by President Obama's My Brother's Keeper initiative. It is an in-school program in Florida's public schools. These boys have earned more than \$10 million in college scholarships, and so many have returned and now serve as role models to the 10,000 boys now in the program.

There are 109 chapters in Miami-Dade County schools, the fourth largest school district in the Nation, 30 chapters in Pinellas County/St. Petersburg schools, and 10 chapters in Duval County, Jacksonville, Florida.

Please welcome the Miami Northwestern Senior High School chapter who are up in the gallery today. I love you, and I am so proud of each and every one of you.

Welcome to Washington.

HONORING VILLAGE OF PINECREST POLICE OFFICER EDISON CRUZ

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Officer Edison Cruz for being named the officer of the second quarter of 2015 of the police department at the Village of Pinecrest, my hometown.

Officer Edison is an invaluable member of the Pinecrest police DUI enforcement program and is highly regarded for his knowledge in this important area of policing and community safety work. Officer Edison's leadership is further exemplified by his role in the coordination of the department's training regarding new DUI blood warrants requirements.

In addition to this most recent honor, Officer Cruz has received two awards from Mothers Against Drunk Driving, MADD, for his successful efforts to protect the public from the terrible crime of drunk driving.

I thank Officer Cruz for his dedication and important work in the service of the people of the place I am so proud to call my home, the Village of Pinecrest.

Congratulations, Officer Edison Cruz.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if it is September, it must mean another shutdown on the horizon. The same small band within the House ma-

jority is demanding another shutdown of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this movie before. In the mid-1990s, conservatives shut down the Federal Government, demanding cuts to Medicare, threatening the healthcare security of seniors.

Just 2 years ago, the government was shut down as conservatives demanded an end to the Affordable Care Act, threatening the healthcare security of millions of Americans. This time, the demand is to end funding for Planned Parenthood, threatening the healthcare security of millions of women, many of them low income.

A recent poll showed that more than 7 out of 10 Americans want Congress to do its job and reach a budget agreement, but like a bad horror movie franchise, the GOP keeps turning out shutdown sequel after shutdown sequel.

Guess what—the American people don't get to walk out on this sequel. They have to sit and suffer through it.

DON SHAW'S RETIREMENT

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a faithful servant of the people of Missouri, Mr. Don Shaw. Don has served the members of Missouri's rural electric cooperatives for 40 years in a variety of capacities, from his start as an electrical engineer to his most recent post as general manager and CEO of Central Electric Power Cooperative.

Don is an outspoken leader in protecting reliable, affordable sources of electricity. His vision and foresight allowed him to take advantage of new technologies, giving high priority to innovative and cost-effective methods to better serve members.

Don has created programs to help alleviate or minimize outage shortage during extreme weather and other natural disasters. In addition, Don helped to build a robust network of fiber optic services to assist the rural membership in staying up to date with an increasingly connected world.

Don has been an active and effective spokesman here at Capitol Hill and back in the Missouri State House. I know this is not the end of service he will provide to his community, State, and country, but merely the end of one more chapter in an extraordinary life.

I would, again, like to thank Don Shaw for his service and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

IMPROVING AIR TRAVEL

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of long-suffering airline passengers. All of us know that air travel is becoming more and more uncomfortable.

At a time when airlines treat passengers so poorly, subjecting us to decreased legroom, cramped planes, more

seats in each row, charging extra fees for luggage or snacks, and many other inconveniences, many people are understandably upset that a CEO of a major airline will receive a golden parachute with up to \$20 million in compensation and free first-class airline tickets for life.

The airline industry is expected to double its profits this year as compared to last year, and even though the fuel prices have dropped 50 percent, ticket prices have barely budged, but what has changed is smaller seats and less legroom.

Since 9/11, the traveling public has complied graciously and patiently with all the new regulations, but once they board the airplane, they are squeezed at every side.

I will soon be introducing legislation that improves the flying experience for the flying public. I think Congress needs to look out for the consumer.

CHIWAUKEE PRAIRIE ILLINOIS BEACH LAKE PLAIN

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chiwaukee Prairie Illinois Beach Lake Plain for being designated as a Ramsar Wetland of International Importance.

As the 38th Ramsar Wetland in the United States, this designation recognizes the Lake Plain for its globally significant contribution to biodiversity and importance to human health and economy.

Mr. Speaker, wetlands are among the Earth's most diverse and productive ecosystems, providing flood control, food, and freshwater. The Lake Plain protects diverse natural communities, including globally rare wetlands, while still being open to the public. This gives our community the chance to experience and enjoy nature, while learning about biodiversity and how to conserve our natural resources.

I specifically want to congratulate the many groups that made this conservation effort possible, including the Lake County Forest Preserve District, the Chiwaukee Prairie Preservation Fund, and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

This honor is only the beginning for the Chiwaukee Prairie Illinois Beach Lake Plain. I look forward to seeing what else they will accomplish in the future.

OPPOSING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN AND RENEWING THE CALL TO CREATE JOBS

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, we have only 6 legislative days left to avoid a reckless and unnecessary government shut-

down. I come to the floor to, once again, urge the leadership of this House to focus on jobs.

We need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, and we need to pass a long-term highway bill and to invest in America's infrastructure, but this House is busy attacking women's health care instead of defending America's economy.

Instead of creating jobs with a highway bill to rebuild America, the majority is fixated on misguided attempts to defund Planned Parenthood. Instead of creating jobs by supporting manufacturers who export to the world, this House is pushing companies to export American jobs.

It is time for this House to focus on rebuilding America and to support American businesses by getting back to the business of the American people.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR'S FIDUCIARY RULE

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express great concern about the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule. This is a rule that is going to have a substantial impact on lower-income and middle-income savers, the men and women and the families that we want to get good advice from advisers so they can save and plan for their retirement. This rule is going to make it harder for American families to save for that eventual day of retirement.

For decades, my constituents in Wisconsin have been served by well-regulated financial institutions, and they include the mutually owned cooperatives and the fraternal membership organizations. These organizations only do well if they serve their customers and their clients well, and if they don't serve them, the clients walk down the street, and they go somewhere else.

This Department of Labor fiduciary rule is going to take the advice away from folks who need the most advice when they are saving. It is an idea that Washington knows best and that people with full disclosure can't make the right decisions for their families.

This rule is a disaster, and my concern is less people are going to save, which means more people are going to be reliant on the Federal Government. That is a wrong approach. Let's not let this rule go through.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BERA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, in 6 legislative days, our government will shut down. This is a bad idea.

Last time the government shut down, our economy lost more than \$20 billion, \$4 billion in tax refunds were delayed, 20,000 veterans disability claims per

week were delayed, and \$140 million in small business loan applications were not processed. If you look at the analysis, over those 2 weeks, 120,000 fewer jobs were created. This is a bad idea.

In Sacramento County, my home community, thousands of employees of the VA, Department of the Interior, and other agencies were threatened. This hurts American families.

It doesn't have to be this way, Mr. Speaker. We could come together, put together a budget, keep the government open, and get people back to work. That is what we are sent here to do.

Let's work together, Democrats and Republicans. Let's avoid a government shutdown, and let's put America back to work.

DELIGHT BREIDEGAM, JR.

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague Representative RYAN COSTELLO in celebrating the life of and remembering DeLight Breidegam, Jr.

If you have a Deka battery in your car, your motorcycle, or tractor, it is the offspring of a product manufactured by his company, East Penn Manufacturing, and developed by DeLight and his business partner, Karl Gasche.

DeLight started his business with his father at the age of 20. He and his father, DeLight, Sr., worked tirelessly, both at their small company and at part-time jobs, to help make ends meet. Through their tenacious talent, DeLight grew a business that now employs over 7,000 people in Berks County, Pennsylvania, and beyond.

I just wanted to say it was an honor for me to know this great man. He drove me around his battery empire. He showed me his farmhouse, and I said: "How did this business begin, DeLight?"

He said: "Well, my father sent me out in the backyard to fix the battery in the tractor."

I said: "DeLight, I am just glad he didn't send you out there to go shovel manure. We would have a fertilizer empire right here in this community."

Nevertheless, he was an extraordinary man, generous, kind, caring. He supported universities—like Moravian College—Lehigh Valley Hospital, and so many other charities.

I wanted to pay tribute to the life and memory of DeLight Breidegam, Jr.

AIR FORCE CELEBRATES 68TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week, we are celebrating a very special birthday; the United States Air Force is turning 68.

The anniversary is especially important to me because of the men and women I represent at Tyndall Air Force Base in Panama City.

Since my election to Congress, I have gotten to know a great many of them, from three star generals to newly enlisted airmen, and I could not be prouder of their service to our Nation.

Today, the F-22 Raptor from Tyndall's 95th Fighter Squadron are deployed in Europe, supporting the NATO Baltic air patrol mission.

On this momentous anniversary, our grateful Nation says thank you to the 95th Fighter Squadron and all the men and women serving in the United States Air Force around the world.

Aim high. Fly, fight, win.

□ 1230

HONORING DELIGHT BREIDEGAM, JR.

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Mr. DENT to thank and honor a Berks County innovator for his leadership and dedication to the community.

Mr. Speaker, DeLight Breidegam, Jr., passed away last week at the age of 88. He was cofounder and chairman emeritus of East Penn Manufacturing. Under his leadership, East Penn grew to be Berks County's second largest employer.

The company is nothing short of an American success story. East Penn began as a dream of the Breidegam family following World War II. DeLight frequently cited the shortage of batteries during the war as the spark to start the business. Along with his father, they soon started their battery business in a small, one-room creamery. Since then, the Breidegam family has been committed to producing batteries.

I had the good fortune to meet with DeLight about a month ago. The value that he placed on his employees was palpable in speaking with him. I must say that it is a very, very special thing when you hear someone speak about their employees in the way that he spoke so lovingly of his, still calling and speaking with them every single day.

He will be missed. He is a tremendous, tremendous asset, as is his company, to the Berks County community; and while we are sad for his passing, Mr. DENT and I wish to recognize him for all his great and positive accomplishments in the community.

LET'S WORK ON KEEPING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OPEN

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are 2 weeks away from a shutdown of the Federal Government. What does that mean for communities like the one I represent in Colorado? Our Federal labs funding Federal research, funding for our universities, our national parks.

When you hear about something like our national parks closing, many people think, okay, maybe it means I delay our vacation. What does it mean to the thousands of people who live in Estes Park and our communities in Grand County, supported almost entirely by Rocky Mountain National Park, which millions of Americans enjoy every year? If they curtail their season by several weeks, they can't afford the rent for their store and can't afford to put their kids through college.

I also want to draw attention to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. After 50 years as one of our country's most successful recreation and conservation programs, funding needs to be reauthorized by September 30 or it could be lost forever.

There are so many things we could be discussing with only 14 days until a government shutdown. Instead, this body is about to go into debating two bills which the President will veto which don't fund a single thing with regards to keeping the Federal Government open.

Let's focus on what we need to do. Let's get to work. Let's make sure we can grow our economy and keep the Federal Government open.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 17, 2015.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 17, 2015 at 9:05 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 70.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 73.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 74.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 420

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-26. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment

thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 24, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 420 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? The question resonates throughout our Nation. It is the driving force behind every solution the Republican majority has offered to this body and every solution this administration has rejected.

I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Committee on Rules. This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 348, the RAPID Act, and H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015.

The Committee on Rules met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from a Republican member of the Committee on the Judiciary and two Democratic members of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on Rules solicited amendments for both these measures, but no amendments were submitted for the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, making the rule closed. There were 11 amendments submitted for the RAPID Act by both Republican and Democratic Members. This rule makes 10 of those in order. Let me repeat that: 11 amendments submitted, and 10 of those amendments are on the floor. Both the RAPID Act and the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act went through regular order in the Committee on the Judiciary, including robust amendment debate.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary for each piece of legislation.

I appreciate the hard work of the Committee on the Judiciary chairman,

Mr. BOB GOODLATTE, and his full committee and subcommittee staffs in bringing forward these key reforms. It would take more than 60 minutes to list all the ways Republicans have worked to encourage economic growth and create jobs in the 114th Congress. We have worked tirelessly to pass litigation reforms that would promote access to court and ensure the cost of litigation isn't being used to force settlements.

I am a proud cosponsor of the RAPID Act because men and women across the Nation are ready to go back to work. Republicans are committed to giving job creators the confidence to take projects off the drawing board and onto the worksite.

A 2012 U.S. Chamber of Commerce study of proposed projects in just one sector of the economy, the energy sector, found that if a modest number of these projects were allowed to move forward and begin construction, the direct and indirect economic benefits would be tremendous—hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars annually.

Hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars are in the pipeline, and Republicans believe we should streamline the approval process so that these projects are either approved or denied, not left languishing year after year.

Americans need jobs now. They have bills to pay and families to feed. The RAPID Act is one of a number of solutions offered by House Republicans that would break down unnecessary Federal barriers and allow employers to break ground on the projects that offer Americans jobs and economic growth.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, NEPA, was designed for an important purpose, one that should be preserved. The Committee on the Judiciary has done important work exploring the original goals of NEPA and hearing from experts in the field and academic scholars. The facts are clear: The NEPA process we have today is far removed from what the authors intended. It is normal for the review process to take years and years, and in some cases over a decade. Imagine how the world has changed in the past 10 years. It is absolutely mind-boggling that a review process for any project would take a decade.

We live in a world where technology has made the impossible possible. There is no excuse for relying on old methods or overly complex regulatory frameworks. It is time for Federal regulators to stop tying up capital and prioritizing endless paper pushing over job creation.

We can do better as a nation. Our economy and our families depend on us doing better.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 348, the RAPID Act, is an attempt to limit flexibility and eliminate the public's role in environmental review and decisionmaking processes. H.R. 758 would force judges to impose sanctions against any claim that appears to lack support or involve a novel legal theory.

These are no doubt important issues to debate and discuss, and we will have that time on the floor, but I want to address what this body is failing to address. Though the subject matter of these two bills couldn't be different, neither one of them relates to the fact that we are 6 legislative days before a job-killing, money-wasting shutdown of government.

Now, when we hear 6 legislative days, let me translate that for normal days that Americans have. That is actually 14 days. We are 14 days until we risk the government shutting down. Of the next 14 days, Congress is only scheduled to work 6. Now, by the way, we should thank Pope Francis for that, because before Pope Francis scheduled his visit, Congress was scheduled to work 4 of the next 14 days.

Now, if everything were going wonderfully and this body was a model of keeping the government open and fulfilling its responsibilities, I think the American people would say: "Well, guess what, Congress. You deserve a vacation." But that is not what I hear from my constituents. They are not saying that we should be on vacation 8 out of the next 14 days when we are facing a government shutdown.

Not only are we facing a government shutdown now, but we are 76 days after the expiration of the Export-Import Bank, which already has lost at least 500 jobs here in our country. We are 41 days until authorizing legislation to maintain our Federal highway systems expire. We have already passed that deadline twice and done short-term extensions.

In my August townhall meetings—and I had a number of them across the district—I do not recall any of my constituents telling me their family's top concerns are we start eliminating environmental reviews and public health standards.

While we are wasting unconscionable time on issues when we are only 6 legislative days or 14 real days from a shutdown, we wonder why this body is losing popularity every day among the American public and will continue to.

To my friends across the aisle, I want to work with you. My Democratic colleagues want to work with you. We want to work to avoid a government shutdown. We want to work with you to reauthorize the Federal highway bill.

These are not Democratic or Republican principles. Both parties believe in a Federal Government; both parties believe in highways and investment in infrastructure. So let's do that. I think we should do that all 14 days, or at

least 12 of the next 14 days rather than 6, but at least let's get to work and do it.

I think we share many of the same domestic and foreign policy interests, and hopefully we can agree upon our priorities. The average American family in my district and across our country has no interest in grandstanding on display. They have no desire to send their hard-earned dollars in taxes to a body that continues to govern crisis by crisis, sometimes after the fact.

□ 1245

So I implore my colleagues to use the next 14 days—or, if they want to take 8 of them off, 6 days—to consider the threat we are facing and the hardship a shutdown would cause in districts like mine that rely on two major universities to receive Federal funding; Federal labs; national parks that support countless local businesses that would close if the Federal Government is closed; the Centers for Disease Control, with a strong presence in Fort Collins; and the many other secondary and tertiary effects that a Federal shutdown would have.

Let's find a way to avert it. There is still time. Let's not wait until it is 2 days or 1 day or zero days or negative 1 day or just hours remaining on the countdown clock. Let's pass a bipartisan bill to fund government. Let's reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Let's make a long-term commitment to our Federal highway system and infrastructure to keep our economy growing.

After we fulfill these basic needs, these self-created crises that Congress is presented, then let's have a discussion about limitation of irregular lawsuits or eradication of environmental reviews on public projects. We can have our disagreements. We can debate them. But let's get our priorities right.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we just got back after spending time in our districts, and I know, in my case, one of the reasons that we are back today dealing with regulatory issues is just a couple of examples that just continue to come up in conversations.

There were always questions about, frankly, what are we doing in Washington, what are we not doing in Washington, but there was a common theme when I went to small business, factories, and when we do roundtables. The common theme was: Why is Washington constantly keeping me from doing what I can do or need to do in my business? Why are we continuing to get regulation after regulation after regulation that keep us from expanding our business?

I had a businessowner tell us in a roundtable that right now there were several businesses he knew that would be willing to hire upwards of 20, 30, 40 folks, but right now they are bound by

the caps that they find under the healthcare law. They don't want to go over a certain number—that magic 49. They don't want to get involved in other areas that are keeping them constricted to this point.

So when we look at these packages of bills that we are looking at, frankly, we are looking at everyday moms and dads; we are looking at businessowners; we are looking at the folks who are the economic engines of the United States; and we are saying the government should not be the inhibitor of your company. The government should not be the part that is stopping you from creating jobs, from getting that next big idea, from having that next product that hits the market that takes us to that different level or hiring that next person who has that spark, that creative energy to say: "Here's the next idea that changes even how we are here today."

So when we deal with this and we look at it, the question really is: What drives jobs? The House majority, the Republican majority, constantly has looked at what it means to be an entrepreneur and to have people that you employ. What does it mean? It means giving someone a chance.

This summer, I had the awesome fun or joy, if you will, of watching my son get his first job. He started to work at a grocery store, and I can remember at first he was all excited. He went through all the process and he got that job. The best day was when he actually came home after working and he was tired, but yet it was payday. He came in and he looked at me and he said: "Dad, I got my paycheck."

And for a moment, regardless of how much that check was—this is not a story about seeing taxes for the first time; my son has lived in my house and he understands the burden of taxes, so it was not any of that—it was just the joy in his eyes that someone had given him a job and that he went to work. It was that pride of having money that he could spend. There is a new person in the economic engine.

That is why we continue to bring these bills forward, so that government can be out of the way and be its proper role, not the roadblock to job creation. When we do that, then the people of the United States can look at this House Republican majority and know our best interests are with those who get up every day looking to make life just a little bit better.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado for the time to speak on this important issue.

I rise today in opposition to the previous question in order to give House Members an opportunity to vote on reauthorizing the charter of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, it is well past time to end the ideologically driven shutdown of the Export-Import Bank that has prohibited this critical agency from continuing to support United States businesses and their workers.

For almost 2 years, Democrats have been sounding the alarm that a shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank would be devastating for American businesses and their workers. Since Republicans in Congress let the Bank's charter expire in June, companies around the country have been preparing to lay off employees, and many have stopped expansion plans because they now lack the critical financing tools that Ex-Im provides.

In fact, just last week, General Electric announced that, due to the GOP shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank, more than 500 jobs will be shipped to places like France and China. Last month, Boeing told its workers that it expected to cut as many as several hundred jobs at its southern California-based satellite factory after a multi-million-dollar contract was scuttled due to uncertainty about the future of the Export-Import Bank.

Republican obstructionism is also having a direct impact on countless small businesses around this country, many of which are set to lose their Ex-Im-backed insurance policies in the coming weeks.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of this House supports reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, but if we don't give Members the opportunity to vote up or down on reopening the Bank's doors today, the self-inflicted shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank may continue for months on end.

If that scenario plays out, the damage to our businesses, their workers, and our economy will only get worse. The consequences for average taxpayers would get worse as well. Because the Bank generates income through fees it charges for its services, failure to reauthorize the Bank means throwing away billions of dollars that would otherwise be transferred to hard-working American taxpayers. Accordingly, we should reauthorize the Bank. If we did, we could raise billions of dollars in profit for U.S. taxpayers over the coming years. The House should take a position.

Mr. Speaker and Members, we have too many Republicans, our friends on

the opposite side of the aisle, claim they support small businesses. They want to do everything that they can to get rid of the regulatory obstacles to small businesses being able to grow and expand. They talk about this with community banks. They talk about this with all kinds of businesses. But look what they are doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. They have absolutely stood in the way of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

And where does that place this country? It places us in a position where we cannot compete with other countries who fully support the export opportunity. So I would ask my colleagues to please vote on this bill at this time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we might indeed take up legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Because I think the gentleman from Georgia has it exactly right, the question before this Chamber, before this Congress, before the President, before the American people is: Where are the jobs?

Now we know where the jobs, in part, have come from over the last 8 years. In fact, about 1.5 million of them have come through the activity of the Export-Import Bank, where they supported \$200 billion in exports spread out across 7,300 companies. And we know where the jobs have not come from since July 1, when the charter of the Export-Import Bank expired, at which time there were 116 deals frozen, constituting \$9.3 billion in activity.

Who were they?

Norwest Ingredients is a company in my home State that sells mint flavoring for the manufacturers of candy and oral care. The company currently employs about a dozen employees. It is a small business.

Without Ex-Im, many small businesses like Norwest aren't going to be able to extend terms to foreign buyers, and they will have to ask for cash in advance. When they do, they will lose their business to other countries who have export credit authorities.

By way of reminder, every single developed nation on the face of the Earth has an export credit authority right now, except the United States of America.

Combustion Associates in California, they spent 3 years closing a deal for a new power project in Nigeria that would generate \$39 million in revenue and create 30 new American jobs. The deal is on hold, along with two other projects that would have been worth

nearly \$50 million in revenue and 100 jobs.

GE, the gentlewoman from California shared the sad news of the 500 jobs that are leaving these shores as a consequence of our failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im.

Digital Check, an Illinois company, sells check scanning equipment to clients in nearly 100 countries. Tom Anderson is the family-run company's chief executive. He says: We're losing now a quarter million in sales in British markets and around \$300,000 in India. And that half-million-dollar hit is causing the company to reevaluate whether they will suspend, altogether, their scanner leasing services.

FirmGreen—Steve Wilburn, president of FirmGreen and, I might add, a proud and highly decorated marine—laid off 10 of its 17 employees last year because the company lost \$60 million in contracts during our latest period of uncertainty.

They are now, right as we speak, right as we are attempting to answer the question of where are the jobs, competing for a \$300 million project in the Philippines, and it hinges on securing export credit financing from the Ex-Im. Without it, that business is going to likely go to a South Korean rival and, with it, the 400 jobs he would have added.

Boeing, again, the gentlewoman made mention of layoffs in El Segundo, California. That was not the first but the second satellite sale to a foreign company and country that we lost as a consequence of the uncertainty surrounding the Export-Import Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HECK of Washington. The outgoing CEO, Mr. MCNERNEY, said: "We never would have considered that before this craziness on Ex-Im. We love making and designing airplanes in the U.S. We are now forced to think about doing it differently."

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, we have now moved beyond the theoretical and the abstract. We are now in the phase of this debate where real people with real jobs and real families are losing their livelihood. The question is right: Where are the jobs? The answer is: In reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Defeat the previous question so that we might do what a majority of this body wants to do, which is continue to compete in a global economy.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the will of the majority is being thwarted in this House, the people's House. Mr. BOEHNER, our Speaker, said when he took his office as Speaker that the House

worked best when the House was allowed to work its will. Mr. Speaker, let the House work its will.

□ 1300

We are about to take a vote on whether this House should move to reopen the Export-Import Bank and save thousands—thousands—of jobs that Speaker BOEHNER has admitted will be lost without our action.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that supports job creation here in America by helping American businesses compete in foreign markets—in other words, making goods here with American workers and selling them abroad. That is what we need to be doing. The Export-Import Bank facilitates that happening. It has over 300 votes out of 435 on this floor, but we cannot vote if it is not brought to the floor.

When the Speaker and majority leader allowed the Bank's authorization to expire in June, they did so with the full knowledge that a reauthorization has the votes to pass and will pass with strong, bipartisan support if brought to the floor. Now, we have a chance to defeat the previous question and bring that bill to the floor today.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to some of my colleagues who may be new, that voting down this rule, defeating the previous question is a vote to open the Export-Import Bank.

Now, I know some of you will say: Well, it is a procedural vote. My party makes me do this.

Well, if you have that answer, look in the eye those who are losing their jobs and say: I had to do this for my party, not my country, not the competitiveness of America, not for American jobs, not for American businesses, but I voted for the previous question for my party.

Sometimes, my friends, party demands too much. When you raise your hand, it is to defend the Constitution and laws thereof, but in a real sense, it is to defend and make America better.

Let's refuse to engage in what Chamber of Commerce CEO Tom Donohue today called a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Let me repeat that. That is Tom Donohue, president of the Chamber of Commerce. The Republican Party used to be a party of business, the party that wanted to grow jobs. We talk about that all the time.

Well, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, you have an opportunity to do that on this upcoming vote. Don't do as Tom Donohue today said you might do, a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Last week, General Electric announced it would be moving 500 jobs from New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Maine to Europe and China because of the failure of this Congress to

pass the Export-Import Bank reauthorization. There are over 300 votes for that on this floor.

The American people think we are dysfunctional. They are right. They don't trust us because they don't think their board of directors is doing the job they sent us here to do. They are right. They are angry. They are anxious.

Let us for once, this day—we haven't funded the government yet; hopefully, we will get that done—but at least this day, given the opportunity on this previous question, say that we are going to make America competitive and we are not going to unilaterally disarm.

This is something the Business Roundtable wants us to do. It is something the Chamber of Commerce wants us to do. It is something the National Association of Manufacturers wants us to do. It is something that organized labor wants us to do.

In the face of unity of purpose, in the face of a majority of votes on this floor, party regularity still says: Tough. Tough. Yes, there may be 300 votes on this bill, but we are not going to allow it to come to the floor.

Ladies and gentlemen in your offices or on this floor, America expects you to do better. America expects you to be responsible. America does not want you to be simply partisan. America does not want you to be cowed by a small minority of this House and by radical groups outside this House who threaten Members they will spend a million or \$2 million or \$3 million to defeat them in a primary.

America wants us to do the right thing. America wants us to have the courage of our convictions. America expects this House to reflect the majority opinion, not be dictated to by a small minority.

Mr. Speaker, allow your Members to vote against the previous question. If you do so, we will bring to this floor the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank; and, ladies and gentlemen of this House—and all Americans ought to know as well—it will pass.

Bring the Export-Import Bank bill reauthorization to this floor so America can continue to be competitive and create jobs here in America. That is what our constituents want us to do.

Vote against the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to take a vote on whether this house should move to reopen the Export-Import Bank and save thousands of jobs that even Speaker BOEHNER has admitted will be lost without our action.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that supports job creation here in America by helping American businesses compete in foreign markets.

When the speaker and majority leader allowed the bank's authorization to expire in June, they did so with the full knowledge that a reauthorization has the votes to pass—and will pass with strong bipartisan support—if brought to the floor.

Now we have a chance to defeat the previous question and bring that bill to the floor today.

Let's end the uncertainty that has already caused businesses to hold back investment in

job creation and to move American jobs overseas.

Let's refuse to engage in what Chamber of Commerce CEO Tom Donohue today called a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Last week, general electric announced that it would be moving 500 jobs from New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Maine to Europe and China because of the failure to keep the export-import bank open.

Congress has a responsibility to help grow jobs here—not send them overseas.

It's time to reopen the export-import bank.

Defeat this previous question.

Bring the export-import bank up for a vote.

And let's complete the task that America's workers and their employers have asked us to do for months.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend: Do you have any more speakers? Or are you prepared to close?

Mr. POLIS. We have a lot of Democrats that want to talk about keeping government open. I hear no Republicans here.

With good respect to my friend from Georgia, where are the Republican ideas to keep government open?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I am trying to get an answer to a question. That means you do not have any more speakers on this. Are you ready to close?

Mr. POLIS. We are ready to use all of our time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the Speaker how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia if he plans to use his 23 minutes?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. That is why I was asking the gentleman from Colorado if he is prepared to close. I have no other speakers.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I will use our 9 minutes. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, shortly, I will be offering an amendment to the rule. The amendment will waive the two-thirds requirement to consider a rule on the same day as reported from the Rules Committee on the legislative days of September 24 and September 25, 2015.

This will provide the flexibility necessary during the Pope's visit to ensure the House completes its business on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I think it is clear. We have had many Democrats coming to the floor talking about what we should be doing. I think the gentleman from Georgia might be the only Republican

in the Chamber. Maybe there is one other in the back. I don't have my glasses on.

We have a lot of ideas for keeping government open. Mainly, let's pass a continuing resolution to do it now. Let's work more than 6 days out of the next 14. Let's stay here until we can keep government open, until we can reauthorize the transportation and infrastructure bill.

It sounds obvious to me; yet there just didn't seem to be any interest from the other side. No Republicans have approached me about keeping government open. I hope you do, Mr. Speaker. I hope you encourage your colleagues to. There is no one here in the Chamber talking about what we can do to avoid a job-crushing government shutdown, which we are 14 days away from.

Instead, we are talking about unrelated bills. Now, I don't deny that these bills deserve their day in the sun. I just question whether, when we are 6 legislative days from a job-crushing shutdown, it is the time to discuss whether we should amend requirements set out by the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, that would reduce the role of public input and turn the idea of NEPA on its head by eliminating any illusion of objective or scientific analysis by allowing private sponsors to write parts of their own environmental reviews.

Now, look, we can discuss that. I am strongly for reforming the NEPA process. As an example, if we can make it easier to site renewal energy projects, I am a sponsor of a bill to expedite the NEPA process for solar and wind infrastructure projects.

Look, there are people who support this terrible bill in its current form; I completely understand that, but this bill does nothing to avert a job-destroying government shutdown that we are only 6 legislative days from reaching.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia mentioned this, what we call a martial law amendment. With this amendment that he is proposing with this rule—we just got notice of it last minute here on the floor—he is offering an amendment that will allow any bill to be brought up under martial law next week.

Now, in honor of Pope Francis' visit, I hope that they have a bill that they plan to bring to the floor under martial law to reduce our carbon emissions and finally do something to impact climate change, which I hope that Pope Francis will be addressing.

I also hope that, under martial law, they will bring forward a bill to replace our broken immigration system with a humane system, with a pathway to citizenship that replaces the chaos we have, with the rule of law, border security, and a pathway to normalization and citizenship for hard-working, aspiring Americans who are already here.

Now, I am not going to bet the ship that that is what they are going to do

with this martial law, but the fact of the matter is, from a process perspective, we—myself, my colleagues, and I think most of the Republican rank and file—simply don't know what they are going to do with that authority.

This is going around the normal rules of the House to establish a mechanism to avoid the normal process, avoid the normal process through Rules Committee and, through martial law, bring some sort of bill. I hope it is an immigration reform bill. I hope it is a climate change bill. I don't think it is.

Based on what we are seeing this week, it will probably be some NEPA bill or some—I don't know—some other bill that doesn't avoid a government shutdown to the floor of the House.

Maybe it will be a bill that is a Republican funding bill that will have a Presidential veto threat over it. That doesn't avoid a shutdown. Remember, the only way we can avoid a shutdown is the House, the Senate, and the President of the United States are on the same page for legislation to avoid a government shutdown.

Let's give them the benefit of the doubt, and we will be back next week, and I will hold my criticism. I hope it is an immigration reform bill. I hope it is a climate change bill.

I hope we honor Pope Francis by bringing forward two of his top priorities in a week that is appropriate, and if that is the case, I will support martial law for those two efforts, and I hope that that is what we will do.

I will withhold judgment until we see what the Republicans attempt to do with this procedural bypass of our normal mechanisms that they have scheduled for next week.

Look, these are bad bills under this rule. They are bad bills today. They would be bad bills if they were appropriate to consider. I believe they are inappropriate to consider in light of a job-crushing government shutdown occurring in 6 legislative days.

The RAPID Act, which would turn the idea of NEPA on its head, is a one-size-fits-all approach. It is not the right approach to NEPA reform.

There are thoughtful, bipartisan ideas that we could put together after we avoid a government shutdown. I am happy to do that.

The LARA Act is even worse. Our country tried a similar framework to LARA in the eighties and early nineties, and there is broad consensus that the experiment failed. Instead of reducing lawsuits, there was an explosion of litigation, causing delays and wasting judicial resources. Why on earth are we giving these failed ideas a second try?

The LARA Act would have prevented landmark decisions like the *Brown v. Board of Education*, which desegregated schools; *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which established constitutional protections for right to privacy; and *Loving v. Virginia*, which ended bans on interracial marriage.

Rather than "preventing abuse," this bill would actually promote civil rights

abuses and weaken the courts' ability to crack down on people who seek to discriminate illegally at work or school or at the voting booth, and Congress should not pass this bill, now or ever.

I think it is particularly offensive, when a job-crushing government shutdown is looming, to even be talking about these other items rather than discussing how we can avoid a job-crushing government shutdown.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure I am clear. These issues we should discuss. Natural resources. The World Health Organization estimates that 2 million people a year are killed because of air pollution. But putting forth these bills now does nothing to eliminate or deal with a job-crushing government shutdown.

Over just 16 days in 2013, our country lost \$24 billion in economic growth, hundreds of thousands of Federal workers were furloughed, contractors and subcontractors were not paid. It is an avoidable scenario. It is a crisis created by Congress. We wonder why people don't like Congress. It is a crisis of our own making.

Why are we threatening the critical, everyday services Americans rely on, the millions of people that work for contractors and subcontractors of the Federal Government?

A small-R republic is a system of governance in which people exert influence over their elected officials, and those representatives are supposed to listen and act upon those requests.

We need to listen to the American people and take the responsible course, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to join me on this commonsense mission before it is too late.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation. We need to reinstate a legislative agenda that aligns with the desires and wills and aspirations of the American people and American businesses.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, just to clear up a couple of things here. One, let me be clear that nothing in this rule or the amendment waives the normal Rules Committee hearing process.

It simply provides us with the flexibility to consider bills on the floor sooner while the Pope is here. It does nothing to waive the normal committee process for bills that should go to Rules, just to clear up that.

I do appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's concern about our speakers and the fact that he was counting today. I was glad to see that he had three people come to speak on the rule that had nothing to do with the bills in the underlying rule. So that was pretty impressive.

I will stand with one person speaking on the rules and the truth of the fact that regulatory burden has a crushing

role on business. I will stand, one, by myself all day.

And then in just a few hours, when we discuss this in the debate process, we will have plenty of people to discuss the actual bills themselves.

So let me close up by talking about what we are here for. My friends across the aisle want to portray House Republicans as being against things and against people.

Yes, it is true we have said "no" to bad policies and priorities of the administration. We have refused to turn a blind eye to those who exploit our legal system.

We have said "no" to the Federal regulators who are indefinitely delaying projects that would put Americans back to work.

We have said "no" to the tax more, spend more, save less, Big Government, job-killing machine that is crushing the American spirit and our economic growth.

But this majority says "yes" to solid, principled legislation that protects Americans' personal and economic liberties. Later today, we will say "yes" to life.

We will vote to protect the babies born alive despite the efforts to abort them. Regardless of the circumstances in which a baby is born alive, they are a person just like you or I. To fail to recognize their humanity is to deny our own.

This House majority says "yes" to fiscal responsibility, "yes" to the commonsense principle that our Nation should have a budget and actually stick to it.

We say "yes" to responsible oversight efforts because we understand, as our Founding Fathers did, that Americans' rights and liberties are only safe while the Federal Government is held within the bounds of the Constitution.

We say "yes" to free market principles because we recognize that economic growth is rooted in the ingenuity of America's entrepreneurs, not government programs.

We have replaced government with growth and regulations with reform. We have restored transparency and trust. We have given our Nation reason to believe that one day our children won't be looking for a job because government has crushed them. They will be creating jobs.

House Republicans have heard the cries of the American people, and today, tomorrow, and every day to come we will continue to fight for them. We will fight so that they can realize their hopes, their dreams, and their ambitions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF
GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end the following:
SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a

report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of September 24, 2015, or September 25, 2015.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does this amendment to the rule mean that Members of this body will have less than 24 hours to review any bill we consider next week?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the meaning of the pending proposition.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the meaning is very straightforward. That is exactly what it means.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 420 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 421 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 421

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon passage of H.R. 3134 the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 764 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3134, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended.

SEC. 4. Upon passage of H.R. 3504 the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 1603 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3504, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended.

SEC. 5. House Resolution 408 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 421 provides closed rules for consideration of H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, and H.R. 3504, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Today, Madam Speaker, we provide for consideration of two vital pieces of legislation addressing one of the most important issues of our time.

On many previous occasions, my colleagues and I have spoken on the issue of abortion and the tragedy it is that unborn children are not safe and protected.

We are not here today, though, debating the policy of abortion on-demand. We are debating specific legislative reactions to horrific wrongs that have come to light: the deliberate dismemberment of unborn children to receive compensation for their organs and other body parts and the failure of abortion facilities to care for children born alive during failed abortions. Even some who support elective abortion agree that those practices are barbaric and must be stopped.

The horrific reality of these practices in the abortion industry have become clear over the past few months, as undercover videos have been released of Planned Parenthood's leaders and affiliates discussing painstakingly dismembering unborn children for compensation.

In these days of 3-D ultrasounds and high-definition screens, it is impossible to hide the humanity of these child victims. They have fingers and toes, heartbeats, and organs developed enough that tissue collectors will pay \$60 a specimen for them.

In light of the serious questions raised by these videos, the House Committees on Energy and Commerce, Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform have each launched investigations.

While Planned Parenthood does not receive direct Federal funding for abortions, these investigations are warranted, as a recent report from the Government Accountability Office shows that the organization receives an average of \$500 million taxpayer dollars each year for other lines of business. Money is fungible, and the Federal funds that Planned Parenthood receives ultimately subsidize their abortion services.

Given the serious allegations that have been raised about Planned Parenthood's abortion practices related to the procurement and sale of tissue and organs from aborted, unborn children, it is appropriate for Congress to pass H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, placing a 1-year moratorium on all Federal funds while Congress conducts its investigation.

No organization that performs divisive practices like abortion, particu-

larly in such a gruesome, profitable manner, should receive taxpayer dollars, and this legislation advances that principle.

In addition, the examples of Kermit Gosnell's convictions for murdering children born alive at his house of horrors and separate reports of unborn children may have been born alive or "intact" prior to being sold to tissue collectors have exposed the need for strengthening the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act.

The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which became law in 2002, extended critical legal protections to babies who are born alive after a failed abortion attempt. That bill passed the House Judiciary Committee with only two dissenting votes and was passed by the Senate by unanimous consent.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 3504, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, goes one step further to protect these vulnerable lives by requiring healthcare practitioners present at the time of birth to administer professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child.

This small, but important, step ensures the protection and preservation of precious, newborn life by providing for criminal penalties when that life is lost as a result of negligence.

These tiny, precious, vulnerable lives deserve the protection afforded all other persons under the law, and this bill ensures that their lives are protected.

□ 1330

Madam Speaker, I commend this rule and both the underlying bills to my colleagues for their support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, my good friend, Dr. FOXX, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong opposition to H.R. 3134 and H.R. 3504 and in very strong opposition to the underlying closed rule.

Today, the House should be debating a bill to keep the government open before funding runs out at the end of the month. We have just 6 legislative days before there is a government shutdown—6 legislative days—and instead of tackling this, we are once again debating another Republican attack on women's health.

In 6 legislative days, the government might shut down; and I am worried because, judging from recent events within the Republican caucus, the right hand doesn't know what the extreme right hand is doing. They can't seem to get along with each other, and I am afraid yet there will be another catas-

trophe and everything will come to a halt, and the people that will suffer will be the people of this country whom we are supposed to represent.

Madam Speaker, in fact, the Republicans were in such a hurry to waste our time with this destructive legislation that one of the bills we are considering, H.R. 3504, had no hearings—not one, none—no markup, and this is the first time we are seeing the bill—and no amendments, by the way. Nobody can offer an amendment. It is totally closed.

Whatever happened to regular order? This process, Madam Speaker, stinks, and it is indefensible.

Of all the measures that have come before the Rules Committee, more than 75 percent have completely ignored regular order and were rushed to the floor without a legislative hearing and markup, denying the people's elected representatives the opportunity to hear the experts and speak up for their constituents. Well, when you look at the politically motivated legislation that regularly comes before this body, I guess it is easy to see why. This is not how the people's House is supposed to work.

Late last night, the Republican majority of the Rules Committee took another shortcut through a process called self-executing that let them slip an amendment offered by Mrs. ELLMERS into today's legislation to redirect funding away from Planned Parenthood facilities. Under regular order, this amendment would have required three waivers—three. It would require three waivers from the committee to be considered on the House floor.

On top of that, the Ellmers amendment would have also violated section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits the consideration of legislation that exceeds a committee's allocation of budget authority. But the Republican-controlled Rules Committee said: Who cares? We are in charge. We don't care about the rules. We don't want to be fair. We don't want to be open. We don't want to be transparent. We are in charge, and we can do whatever we want.

Madam Speaker, this is just another attempt by the House majority to shut out debate on important issues and ignore the House rules when it is convenient for them. During this Congress alone, 118 waivers have been granted; 115 of those waivers, 97 percent, have been for Republicans. Instead of the House Rules Committee, we should be known as the House Break-the-Rules Committee, because that is all the Rules Committee seems to do. It breaks rules, goes around rules, and tries all kinds of trickery to be able to force legislation to the floor that limits debate and doesn't allow Members to offer amendments.

This legislative process in this House has become a joke. It is shameful, and this is not serious legislating.

With one bill after another, Republicans have repeatedly hurt our country's most vulnerable families, and

these bills today are just the latest chapter. This is nothing new.

One of the first acts of the Republican House majority in 2011 was to drive us to the brink of a government shutdown over Planned Parenthood. In October 2013, Republicans did shut down the government by insisting on defunding the Affordable Care Act. Now, 2 years later, they are right back to threatening a Republican government shutdown over Planned Parenthood.

H.R. 3134, the so-called Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, is a bad and a backward-thinking bill. In the 114th Congress, the House has already taken four anti-women's health votes and today sets the stage for us to take two additional votes to restrict women's access to women's health care. Incredibly, this is already twice the number of anti-women's health votes than at this same point in the 113th and 112th Congresses—and this Congress is not even half over.

In this Republican Congress, facts don't matter. We don't talk about facts. They are inconvenient and they are a nuisance—especially when they get in the way of their extremist political agenda.

The fact is that Planned Parenthood plays a critical role in protecting and providing access to critical health services for both women and men. One in five women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, and Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million patients each year. One of the most important statistics that my Republican friends like to ignore is that more than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does nationally is preventive care, including cervical cancer screenings, breast cancer screenings, and family planning—not abortion services.

I just came from a luncheon a few minutes ago where we were honoring individuals who were leaders in the cancer prevention field, people who have advocated that it is important for all of us to be able to get checkups on a regular basis in order to prevent cancer; and here we are about to vote on a bill that, if the Republicans get their way, would limit and would eliminate access to lifesaving cancer screenings for countless individuals across this country.

What are you thinking? This is not the way we should be proceeding.

Add to this the fact that Planned Parenthood clinics are often one of the few affordable healthcare options available for many women—nearly 80 percent of women using Planned Parenthood clinics have incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty—and it is easy to see why a majority of Americans don't think Federal funding should be eliminated. In one recent poll, 63 percent of voters, including 72 percent of Independents, do not agree with my Republican friends that Federal funding for Planned Parenthood should be eliminated.

Madam Speaker, we have also heard very little from my friends on the other side of the aisle about the consequences that defunding for Planned Parenthood would have for families across the country. One of the biggest myths perpetrated by Republicans is the idea that our Nation's community health centers—which I love, adore, respect, and support—could somehow magically pick up the slack overnight if Planned Parenthood is defunded.

For the millions of low-income women who depend on Planned Parenthood clinics, this scenario would mean the loss of affordable and accessible contraceptive services and counseling, as well as breast and cervical cancer screenings and testing. The idea that our community health centers could, overnight, suddenly step up and cover millions of new patients is simply wrong and shows a fundamental misunderstanding by Republicans of how our country's healthcare system works.

In fact, the Guttmacher Institute recently found that, in 21 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood health center, Planned Parenthood is the only safety net family planning provider. The report also states: "In two-thirds of the 491 counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood health centers serve at least half of all women obtaining contraceptive care from safety net health centers. In one-fifth of the counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood sites are the sole safety net family planning center."

This makes clear just how devastating it would be for these communities to recklessly cut funding for these vital health services for the people who need them most.

Everyone here in this Congress, every single one of us, with the snap of our fingers, can get health care; but with today's bills, Republicans seem to be saying that for families who are poor or who live in rural areas or where this is the only option for preventive care where they live are simply out of luck. Talk about cruel.

Madam Speaker, I have a recent article from the Health Affairs Blog, titled, "Planned Parenthood, Community Health Centers, and Women's Health: Getting the Facts Right." It says: "a claim that community health centers readily can absorb the loss of Planned Parenthood clinics amounts to a gross misrepresentation of what even the best community health centers in the country would be able to do were Planned Parenthood to lose over 40 percent of its operating revenues overnight as the result of a ban on Federal funding."

I will enter the full article into the RECORD.

[From Health Affairs Blog, Sept. 8, 2015]
QUANTIFYING PLANNED PARENTHOOD'S CRITICAL ROLE IN MEETING THE NEED FOR PUBLICLY SUPPORTED CONTRACEPTIVE CARE

(By Jennifer Frost)

Over the past few months, legislative attempts to defund Planned Parenthood have

flared at both the federal and state levels; these moves are clearly an attempt to shutter Planned Parenthood health centers, potentially depriving women of the contraceptive services and counseling, sexually transmitted infection (STI) testing and treatment, and breast and cervical cancer screening that they provide.

Although proponents of closing Planned Parenthood argue that other providers would be easily able to fill the hole torn in the safety net, credible evidence suggests this is unlikely. In some areas, Planned Parenthood is the sole safety-net provider of contraceptive care. And even where there are other safety-net providers, they, on average, serve far fewer contraceptive clients than do sites operated by Planned Parenthood.

As this debate swirls, the Guttmacher Institute received a request from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) regarding the publicly supported contraceptive care provided by Planned Parenthood health centers across the country. To respond, Guttmacher staff conducted special tabulations of our Contraceptive Needs and Services 2010 report (the most recent year for which these data are available).

Our analysis shows unequivocally that Planned Parenthood plays a major role in delivering publicly supported contraceptive services and supplies to women who are in need of such care nationwide. In two-thirds of the 491 counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood health centers serve at least half of all women obtaining contraceptive care from safety-net health centers. In one-fifth of the counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood sites are the sole safety-net family planning center.

Further, the average Planned Parenthood health center serves significantly more contraceptive clients each year than do safety-net centers run by other types of providers, such as federally qualified health centers (FQHCs) or county health departments. As a result, Planned Parenthood centers serve a greater share of safety-net contraceptive clients than any other type of provider. And, Planned Parenthood sites are more likely to make contraceptive care quickly and easily accessible to the women who need it.

CONTRACEPTIVE CARE BY THE NUMBERS

Below are the key takeaways of Guttmacher's findings related to Planned Parenthood's provision of publicly supported contraceptive care.

Planned Parenthood health centers serve a considerable proportion of all clients obtaining contraceptive care from safety-net health centers.

In 2010, 36 percent of the 6.7 million U.S. women receiving contraceptive care from safety-net family planning health centers were served at Planned Parenthood health centers. And there are some areas of the country where women rely particularly heavily on Planned Parenthood: In 18 states, Planned Parenthood health centers serve more than 40 percent of women obtaining contraceptive care from a safety-net family planning health center. In 11 of those 18 states, Planned Parenthood serves more than half the women obtaining contraceptive care from a safety-net health center.

Planned Parenthood health centers often serve most or all of the safety-net contraceptive clients in their county.

In 68 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood site (332 counties out of 491), these sites serve at least half the women obtaining publicly supported contraceptive services from a safety-net health center. And in 21 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood site (103 counties), Planned Parenthood serves all of the women obtaining publicly supported contraceptive services from a safety-net health center.

The majority of women who need publicly supported contraceptive care live in counties with a Planned Parenthood health center.

Almost two-thirds (64 percent) of the 19 million women in need of publicly supported contraceptive services and supplies live in counties with a Planned Parenthood health center. Moreover, 30 percent of these women live in counties where Planned Parenthood serves the majority of those obtaining publicly supported contraceptive care from the family planning safety net. (Women are considered to be in need of publicly supported contraception if they have ever had sex; are aged 13–44; are able to become pregnant; are not pregnant, postpartum, nor trying to become pregnant; and either have a family income below 250 percent of the federal poverty level or are younger than age 20.)

Planned Parenthood health centers serve a greater share of safety-net contraceptive clients than do any other types of providers.

Although Planned Parenthood health centers comprise 10 percent of publicly supported safety-net family planning centers, they serve 36 percent of clients who obtain publicly supported contraceptive services from such centers. By contrast, centers operated by health departments serve 27 percent of safety-net contraceptive clients, FQHCs serve 16 percent, sites operated by hospitals serve 8 percent, and sites operated by other agencies serve 13 percent.

On average, Planned Parenthood health centers serve many more contraceptive clients per year than do other types of safety-net providers. Planned Parenthood health centers serve an average of 2,950 contraceptive clients per year, many times more than any other type of publicly supported health center. By contrast, those operated by hospitals serve an average of 770 contraceptive clients, health departments serve an average of 750, FQHCs serve 330, and centers operated by other types of agencies serve 680 contraceptive clients each year.

Planned Parenthood health centers are more likely to facilitate women's timely access to a wide range of contraceptive services and supplies.

Planned Parenthood sites are considerably more likely to offer a broad range of contraceptive methods than sites operated by other types of agencies. Specifically, 91 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer at least 10 of 13 reversible contraceptive methods, compared to between 48 percent and 53 percent of sites operated by other types of agencies.

Moreover, Planned Parenthood sites are particularly likely to help women who choose oral contraceptives to get their pills without having to make an additional trip to a pharmacy: 92 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer oral contraceptive supplies and refills on-site, as do 86 percent of health department sites. Considerably smaller proportions of sites operated by FQHCs and other types of agencies—37 percent and 55 percent, respectively—do so.

Finally, women are often able to get the care they need more quickly from Planned Parenthood than from other types of safety-net providers. Sixty-three percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer same-day appointments, compared to between 30 percent and 40 percent of sites operated by other types of agencies. And the average wait for an appointment at a Planned Parenthood health center is 1.8 days, whereas wait times at sites operated by other types of agencies range from 5.3 to 6.8 days.

LOOKING AHEAD

We cannot predict whether or to what extent health centers operated by other providers could fill the significant gap in the family planning safety net that would be cre-

ated if Planned Parenthood health centers were defunded—and therefore lost to the communities they serve. Certainly in the short term, it is doubtful that other providers could step up in a timely way to absorb the millions of women suddenly left without their preferred source of care and whether those providers could offer the same degree of accessible, quality contraceptive care offered by Planned Parenthood. (Indeed, Texas offers a cautionary tale; the state's family planning program for low-income women served far fewer women after Planned Parenthood health centers were cut out of the effort.)

What we do know is that women nationwide rely on Planned Parenthood health centers for the contraceptive services and supplies they need—and for women in many areas of the country, losing Planned Parenthood would mean losing their chosen provider and the only safety-net provider around.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Here are some more facts.

For every patient served by a community health center today, nearly three residents of low-income communities remain without access to primary health care. By voting for a sudden cutoff in funding, we would create an immediate healthcare access crisis for millions of women, placing an enormous strain on community health centers and other providers.

Community health centers offer women's health services as part of comprehensive primary care programs. They simply cannot put their other responsibilities aside. With so many of our Nation's community health centers already struggling to meet the needs of our most vulnerable communities, the last thing we should be doing is trying to make their jobs harder.

Now, on top of all of this, Senator MCCONNELL has already said that Senate Republicans do not have the votes to pass this bill and it will never reach the President's desk. So what are we doing here? This is not a rhetorical question. We are literally, as I said earlier, 6 legislative days away from another government shutdown; and instead of talking about how we are going to keep the doors open, how we are going to do what the people of the country have sent us here to do and keep government running, we are wasting time with this politically driven legislation that does nothing to make the country better.

Madam Speaker, the other bill before us, H.R. 3504, is not a simple restatement of the current born-alive law, by the way, which passed by a voice vote in 2002, no. Just so my colleagues understand, this bill fundamentally interferes with the sacred doctor-patient relationship and undermines doctors' clinical judgment and tells them how to provide medicine, or else they will face criminal penalties.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. We already have strong Federal and State laws to protect babies born alive. The bottom line is that these anti-women's health bills would limit women's access to safe, legal, reproductive health care.

Congress should be governing responsibly and working to solve the real issues our country is facing. We should be focused on growing our economy and creating jobs. I think you may have forgotten that that is an important priority of the American people because my friends never like to mention the word "jobs."

But we ought to be focused on creating jobs. We ought to be protecting access to health care, increasing college affordability, and building a better future. Instead, 30 conservative House Republicans have decided to take government funding hostage, and that is what we are here for.

The American people deserve better.

Finally, let's be clear. Let's all kind of clear the air and be honest about one thing. The debate we are having today really isn't about the quality of care provided by Planned Parenthood. That is really not what is at the heart of all this. This is an effort by my friends on the Republican side to kind of pursue their agenda of criminalizing and outlawing abortion in every circumstance.

Many of my colleagues on the other side have been very vocal about the fact that they want to criminalize abortion, even in cases of rape or incest. They would make a woman who is a victim of rape or incest a criminal. They would criminalize the doctors. That is what this is all about, trying to force their narrow agenda down the throats of the American people.

I would say to my colleagues that we ought to reject this and get down to the business of governing this country. This is not what we should be doing here today. This is an insult, I think, to women. This is an insult to the good people who work at Planned Parenthood who provide excellent care to millions of people across this country, and, quite frankly, it is an insult to the American people that, with 6 legislative days left before you shut the government down, this is what you choose to bring to the floor and not a bill to keep the government open.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, if my colleagues would like to use parliamentary terms like "regular order," "self-execute," or "waivers" to hide from debate over the gruesome practices of abortionists, that is their prerogative.

They ignore what one key Planned Parenthood abortionist said: "We've been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, so I'm not gonna crush that part. I'm gonna basically crush below, I'm gonna crush above, and I'm gonna see if I can get it all intact."

□ 1345

Republicans will continue to bring the truth to Americans and prevent taxpayer dollars from going to organizations that dismember children.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, by now, we have all seen the appalling videos which depict Planned Parenthood officials talking about how they crush babies in certain ways to preserve certain organs and then bargaining over the price of those organs.

I want to be crystal clear. The loss of any human life is a tragedy, but the casual nature in which the Planned Parenthood officials talk about killing a baby is simply heartbreaking and appalling. It is unconscionable that any American could be that cold and callous.

Let me tell you about the Planned Parenthood clinic in my hometown of Mobile, Alabama. They were cited by the Alabama Department of Health for performing two abortions on a 14-year-old girl in a span of 4 months without their complying with State laws that require the reporting of possible sexual abuse. This is the type of organization we are talking about.

Congress cannot simply sit on the sidelines and wait for someone else to respond. These egregious actions require a response.

Madam Speaker, I do not believe the Federal Government should be spending a single penny on Planned Parenthood, and H.R. 3134 would make that a reality. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say to my colleague from North Carolina that I am not hiding behind procedural rules.

In fact, in the way that my Republican friends have brought this bill to the floor, you won't allow us to debate amendments. We can't. You have stifled debate.

So I guess I would ask you: What are you afraid of? Why can't we have a more open process on legislation that didn't even go through the committees of jurisdiction? You ought to open this place up. A little debate is not a bad thing. A little openness is a good thing.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the report by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Democratic members and staff, basically that refers to the heavily edited videos that my colleagues refer to.

I will just read one line here:

To date, the committee has received no evidence—underline “no evidence”—to substantiate the allegations that Planned Parenthood is engaged in the sale of fetal tissue for profit.

Furthermore, the committee has received no evidence to support the allegation that fetal tissue was procured without consent, that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purposes of obtaining fetal tissue, or that Planned Parenthood physicians performed intact dilation and evacuation in order to preserve fetal tissue for research.

Thus far, the investigation has revealed that PPFA requires all affiliates

to ensure compliance with all State and Federal laws and that specific PPFA guidance requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement for fetal tissue is limited to actual cost.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
Washington, DC, September 9, 2015.

MEMORANDUM

To Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Democratic Members and Staff
From Committee on Energy and Commerce Democratic Staff

Re Update on the Committee's Ongoing Investigation of Planned Parenthood Federation of America

I. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum serves as an update on the Committee's ongoing investigation into claims regarding the alleged sale of fetal tissue by affiliates of Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) to tissue procurement organizations (TPOs). The review has included bipartisan briefings by Planned Parenthood officials as well as representatives from StemExpress, Novogenix Laboratories, and Advanced Bioscience Resources—three TPOs that partner with Planned Parenthood affiliates and other healthcare providers to collect specimens to supply to researchers working with fetal tissue.

In addition to these briefings, the Committee has received documents and written responses to a series of questions it posed in writing to PPFA regarding its “practices relating to fetal tissue collection and sale or donation.” To date, the Committee has received no evidence to substantiate the allegations that Planned Parenthood has engaged in the sale of fetal tissue for profit. Furthermore, the Committee has received no evidence to support the allegations that fetal tissue was procured without consent, that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purposes of obtaining fetal tissue, or that Planned Parenthood physicians performed intact dilation and evacuation in order to preserve fetal tissue for research. Thus far, the investigation has revealed that PPFA requires all affiliates to ensure compliance with all state and federal laws and that specific PPFA guidance requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement for fetal tissue is limited to actual costs.

The Committee received evidence that the individuals making these unsubstantiated claims misrepresented themselves in order to gain access to Planned Parenthood personnel and facilities, and that the videos released by the Center for Medical Progress (CMP) are incomplete, selectively edited, and intentionally misleading.

II. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD OR ITS AFFILIATES HAVE VIOLATED ANY FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS

A. PPFA REQUIRES ALL AFFILIATES TO COMPLY WITH ALL STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS, INCLUDING LAWS PERTAINING TO THE DONATION OF FETAL TISSUE FOR RESEARCH

i. PPFA Guidance to Affiliates Regarding Human Fetal Tissue Donation Specifically Advises That It Is Illegal to Receive “Valuable Consideration” for Fetal Tissue, and Requires Affiliates to Ensure that Reimbursement Represents Actual Costs

The NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 established the legal standards governing fetal tissue donation. The law states, “It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any human fetal tissue for valuable consideration if the transfer affects interstate commerce.” The law further provides: “The term ‘valuable consideration’ does not include

reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue.”

Current PPFA guidance on fetal tissue donation tracks federal law, and it clearly and explicitly prohibits affiliates from receiving valuable consideration for fetal tissue. The guidance also requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement represents actual costs incurred by the affiliate. The current PPFA guidance, revised in May 2015, provides as follows:

Federal law prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is federally funded or not.

There are limited exceptions that allow reimbursement for actual expenses (e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue. If an affiliate chooses to accept reimbursement for allowable expenses, it must be able to demonstrate the reimbursement represents its actual costs. PPFA recommends that an affiliate consult with CAPS [Consortium of Abortion Providers] about steps to take to document and demonstrate actual cost. [emphasis in the original]

The guidance also advises affiliates that “there are federal, and frequently, state laws that govern these activities, as well as ethical considerations. Great care must be taken to assure that these programs are above reproach in all respects.”

In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. Raegan McDonald-Mosley, the Chief Medical Officer of PPFA, explained that PPFA accredits its affiliates. Affiliates are autonomous legal entities, with their own separate boards, executive personnel, and legal counsel.

Dr. McDonald-Mosley further described how PPFA oversees its affiliates and verifies their compliance with its fetal tissue donation guidance. Each affiliate is independently responsible for ensuring compliance with the guidance, as well as with all applicable state and federal laws.

PPFA oversees its affiliates through an accreditation process, whereby each affiliate is reviewed at least once every three years. Affiliates are evaluated on a range of hundreds of possible elements of performance, including, as of 2013, compliance with PPFA's fetal tissue donation guidance. Accreditation involves both offsite reviews of affiliate documentation as well as onsite reviews that include interviews with staff and direct observation of patient care. Non-compliance with PPFA required standards may affect an affiliate's accreditation status and result in actions that jeopardize that affiliate's ability to continue to use the Planned Parenthood trademark.

Although the precise language of PPFA's fetal tissue guidance has been revised over the years, affiliates have always been required to ensure that their tissue donation programs are in compliance with all state and federal laws, including the prohibition on receiving valuable consideration. For example, an earlier version of the guidance from 2001 provided to the Committee instructs affiliates that federal laws “forbid the payment or receipt of valuable consideration for fetal tissue. However, they permit ‘reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage’ of fetal tissue.” This guidance was reissued to affiliates in 2011.

Several years ago, PPFA undertook an effort to revise their Manual of Medical Standards and Guidelines (the Manual) by removing those sections not directly related to clinical care. According to Dr. McDonald-

Mosley, the Manual is a desk reference for clinicians for directing medical care. It is intended to assist practitioners in providing regular care for a patient and is revised on a two-year cycle. As a result of this revision effort, the fetal tissue guidance was separated from the Manual and is now a stand-alone document. It is distributed to affiliates through the PPFA intranet. Dr. Deborah Nucatola, who is PPFA's Senior Director for Medical Services and has had primary responsibility for the Manual since July 2009, explained to Committee staff that guidance on fetal tissue donation was removed from the Manual as part of this process to streamline and remove non-clinical information.

As of November 6, 2013, affiliates are now permitted to facilitate fetal tissue donation without prior approval from PPFA. PPFA distinguishes between "core services," which all affiliates are required to provide, such as well-women visits and education and prescribing for all FDA-approved methods of contraception, and services which are voluntary or optional for affiliates to offer. Earlier versions of the fetal tissue guidance instructed affiliates to "submit a written request to initiate an aborted tissue and/or blood donation program to PPFA for review and approval." According to PPFA, it "implemented this policy change as part of a broader effort to reduce the administrative burden on affiliates and support affiliate service expansion.

This overhaul affected other services besides facilitation of tissue donation; PPFA no longer requires prior approval for an affiliate to offer certain other non-core services."

ii. PPFA Guidance to Affiliates Includes Additional Requirements Pertaining to Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research, Although This is Not Required by Law

Federal law imposes additional requirements on providers and on researchers when the donated tissue is used in federally funded research involving the transplantation of human fetal tissue for therapeutic purposes. Under the statute, human fetal tissue may be used in federally funded research on the transplantation of fetal tissue if the attending physician declares in writing 1) that the woman's consent for abortion was obtained prior to requesting or obtaining consent to donate the fetal tissue for research; 2) that the timing, method, or procedure used to terminate the pregnancy were not altered in order to obtain the tissue; 3) that the abortion was performed in accordance with applicable state law; and 4) the woman has been fully informed of the physician's interest, if any, in the research, and of any medical or privacy risks associated with the tissue donation.

According to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the federal government has not funded any fetal tissue transplantation research since 2007. The federal rules relating to the timing and method of abortion are therefore not applicable to any recent fetal tissue donations in the United States. However, PPFA's fetal tissue donation guidance nonetheless incorporates these requirements as recommended practices for affiliates. The 2015 PPFA guidance provides:

Federal law establishes additional requirements applicable whenever the research involving fetal tissue is conducted or supported by the federal government. PPFA recommends that these requirements be adhered to without regard to whether the tissue donation program is federally supported or not. These requirements are:

1. That the client's consent to donate not be sought until after she has decided to have an abortion and has signed the consent form for the abortion.

2. That the client acknowledge that the blood or tissue is being donated as a gift and that she will not be paid.

3. That the client acknowledge that she has not been told and that she has no control over who will get the donated blood and/or tissue or what it will be used for.

4. That there will be no changes to how or when the abortion is done in order to obtain the blood or tissue.

The guidance further instructs affiliates that "It must be documented that no substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the blood and/or tissue."

Similarly, earlier versions of the PPFA guidance required the clinician to make a notation that: "[a]borted tissue was donated," "[c]onsent for the abortion was obtained prior to requesting or obtaining consent for the tissue donation," and "[n]o substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the tissue." Previous versions of the guidance also required specific language in consent forms used for tissue donation. These versions were issued under the previous system, in which affiliates were required to seek service approval from PPFA for tissue donation programs.

Appended to PPFA's May 2015 guidance is a recommended sample consent form, which prompts the patient who is donating tissue to affirm the following statements:

Before I was shown this consent, I had already decided to have an abortion and signed a consent form for it.

I agree to give my blood and/or the tissue from the abortion as a gift to be used for education, research, or treatment.

I understand I have no control over who will get the donated blood and/or tissue or what it will be used for.

I have not been told the name of any person who might get my donation.

I understand there will be no changes to how or when my abortion is done in order to get my blood or the tissue.

I understand I will not be paid.

I understand that I don't have to give my blood or pregnancy tissue, and this will not affect my current or future care at (affiliate name).

Earlier versions of the guidance included a substantially similar consent form, although use of the consent form was required rather than recommended under the previous system of service approvals by PPFA, and substantive deviations from the consent form required approval from PPFA Medical Services.

B. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD AFFILIATES KNOWINGLY RECEIVED VALUABLE CONSIDERATION IN EXCHANGE FOR FETAL TISSUE

The Committee has received no evidence that any Planned Parenthood affiliate or employee ever received any "valuable consideration" for donated fetal tissue. The information and the documentary evidence received by the Committee support Planned Parenthood's assertions that the few affiliates that have participated in fetal tissue donation comply with the requirement to limit reimbursement to reasonable payments associated with facilitating tissue donation.

In an August 27, 2015, letter to congressional leaders, PPFA President Cecile Richards listed the reimbursement rates at affiliates that are currently or were recently participating in fetal tissue donation. At present, only two out of PPFA's 59 affiliates are participating in fetal tissue donation, and only one affiliate is receiving any reimbursement for costs. An additional four af-

filates facilitated fetal tissue donation for research in the past five years. The California affiliate that is currently participating receives a reimbursement of \$60 per tissue specimen from a TPO. The other four affiliates, which had participated in fetal tissue donation programs in the past five years, either sought no reimbursement or had reimbursement rates ranging from \$45 to \$55 per tissue specimen. The letter states, "[i]n every case, the affiliates report that these amounts were intended to recover only their costs, as allowed under the federal law and our guidance." The evidence received by the Committee during the course of this investigation supports this assertion.

The May 2015 tissue donation guidance notes that affiliates "must be able to demonstrate the reimbursement represents its actual costs." Dr. McDonald-Mosley explained that the way that each affiliate determines cost is fact-specific to that affiliate. Dr. Nucatola stated that fetal tissue donation is not a revenue stream for affiliates, and that reimbursement should generally be reasonable for the impact it has on the clinic.

Both the statute governing fetal tissue donation and Planned Parenthood's May 2015 guidance on pregnancy tissue donation outline the exceptions for reimbursement. The types of costs that may arise for clinics facilitating tissue donation include staff time to identify patients who are interested in donating fetal tissue, staff time spent explaining fetal tissue donation and securing consent, staff time spent drawing maternal blood samples, space in the pathology lab, storage of supplies, sterilization of equipment, and other related costs.

In a briefing with the Committee, Cate Dyer, the Chief Executive Officer of StemExpress, stated that it is her understanding that the valuable consideration requirement applies to all fetal tissue her company obtains. The contracts between StemExpress and two Planned Parenthood affiliates state, "The reasonable costs associated with the services specified in this Agreement shall be fifty-five dollars (\$55.00) per POC [product of conception] determined in the clinic to be usable." According to Dyer, the reimbursement covers the space and storage at the Planned Parenthood facility, particularly within the lab and pathology departments, sterilization of equipment, and staff participation in consent and facilitating involvement in the clinic. Additionally, clinic staff is also involved in obtaining maternal blood samples for StemExpress, so that the company can screen for infectious diseases. Dyer stated that she believed Planned Parenthood is losing money on fetal tissue donation, given the amount of staff time involved and space StemExpress takes up at the clinics.

In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. Ben Van Handel, the Executive Director of Novogenix Laboratories, confirmed that at the affiliate where Novogenix has a contract, Planned Parenthood set the price of \$45 for services rendered on a per specimen basis. The contract between Novogenix and the Planned Parenthood affiliate states, "Novogenix will reimburse [the Planned Parenthood affiliate] for reasonable administrative costs associated with the identification of potential donors, as well as the obtaining of informed consent."

Similarly, in a briefing with Committee staff, Advanced Bioscience Resources (ABR) confirmed that the reimbursement rate at the Planned Parenthood affiliate with which they partner is \$60 per patient product of conception. The contract between ABR and the Planned Parenthood affiliate states:

[Affiliate] will provide, and ABR will pay the reasonable costs for, services and facilities . . . associated with obtaining consents

and with the removal of fetal organs and tissues from POCs [products of conception], and their processing, preservation, quality control, transportation, and storage; including appropriate space in which ABR employees can work, disposal services for non-used portions of cadaveric materials, and for seeking consent for donation of tissues and organs from appropriate donors, and maintaining records of such consents so that verification of consent can be supported.

C. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD PHYSICIANS CONDUCTED INTACT DILATION AND EVACUATION TO PRESERVE FETAL TISSUE

To date, the Committee has received no evidence that any physician employed by Planned Parenthood affiliates has performed an "intact" dilation and evacuation (D&E) to preserve fetal tissue for research. CMP claims suggesting that Planned Parenthood physicians are violating the Partial Birth Abortion Act in order to preserve fetal tissue for research appear to have no basis in fact.

There are three primary methods of surgical abortion: D&E, induction of labor, and hysterotomy. D&E is the only method available at Planned Parenthood facilities. In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. McDonald-Mosley stated to the Committee that the confusion over "intact" fetuses is the result of deceptive video editing by CMP, and that she believes that the "intactness" that Planned Parenthood staff are referring to is the intactness of the tissue and specific organs. She noted that during most procedures, such as a D&E, the fetus is not delivered intact. She stated there is no evidence that Planned Parenthood staff are removing the fetus in an intact manner.

Similarly, Dr. Nucatola explained that it would be rare for a patient to be sufficiently dilated to deliver an intact fetus. When questioned whether it was possible to do a D&E resulting in an intact fetus, she stated that while possible, no Planned Parenthood physician would intentionally perform such a procedure because to do so would be illegal.

Representatives of all three TPOs also stated to the Committee that the donated fetal tissue specimens they receive do not include intact fetuses.

D. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD PHYSICIANS ALTERED THE TIMING, METHOD, OR PROCEDURE SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING FETAL TISSUE FOR RESEARCH

To date, the Committee has not obtained any evidence that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purpose of obtaining fetal tissue for research. The law requires physicians to certify that "no alteration of the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate the pregnancy was made solely for the purposes of obtaining the tissue." Although this section of the law applies only to federally funded research involving transplantation of human fetal tissue for therapeutic purposes, Planned Parenthood has voluntarily incorporated the principles of the law into its tissue donation guidance. The PPFA May 2015 guidance instructs affiliates that "[i]t must be documented that no substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the blood and/or tissue."

There are limited methods of abortion. At Planned Parenthood affiliates, there are two methods of an early abortion: (1) a medication abortion, and (2) surgical abortion involving mechanical or manual aspiration. For abortions after approximately 13 weeks gestation, the only surgical abortion method available at a Planned Parenthood facility is D&E. A physician's decision about which

method to use is made in consultation with the patient.

PPFA has not identified any cases in which changes in methods for abortions were made for the purposes of fetal tissue donation. It is reasonable for providers to make small adjustments in technique for clinical reasons, and such small adjustments would not constitute a change in method or procedure. As is common across the medical profession, techniques are different for each physician, and physicians commonly make clinical judgments to adjust their approach in the course of a surgery.

Dr. Nucatola confirmed that changing the position of the fetus is not a change in the method or procedure; instead, it often needs to be done for patient safety. Although she does not personally change the position of the fetus in her practice, she believes that some physicians may need to convert the fetus to breech position in order to perform the abortion procedure safely; it is a matter of skill and experience.

All Planned Parenthood staff emphasized that patient safety is their top priority. Dr. McDonald-Mosley stated, "The ultimate goal is the safety of the patient." Dr. Nucatola said, "Patient safety comes first." PPFA's August 27, 2015, letter reiterated the same message: "Our patient's health is our paramount concern."

Mr. MCGOVERN. These heavily edited videos that my friends keep on referring to, again, I think is just a cover for what really is behind all of this, and that is their attempt to criminalize and outlaw abortion in all circumstances.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in defense of Planned Parenthood, an organization that for nearly 100 years has been the only accessible and affordable health care for millions of Americans, men and women.

Yet again, we find ourselves debating a bill that has no chance of becoming law, that attacks women and their healthcare decisions, and that distracts from what we should be doing: a budget to keep the government funded, which the majority shows no interest in moving forward.

Instead, we are rehashing old bills that we have seen many times before. These Republican broadsides fly in the face of the millions of women across the country and undermine the health and well-being of poor and rural women, who, in most cases, have no place else to turn except to Planned Parenthood for basic medical treatment.

Need I remind the Chamber that one in five American women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, as my colleague said, more than 90 percent of which is for preventive care: cervical cancer screenings, breast cancer screenings, and even HIV counseling?

There is no other medical procedure so furiously debated. Do we spend years here debating whether men can get

vasectomies during their reproductive years? Maybe we should do that because, obviously, we have cloaked ourselves in the medical field so that we can make those priceless decisions that people should make for themselves. Do we threaten to shut down the government over access to Viagra? No, we don't.

This week, I received an email from a local Planned Parenthood affiliate about a woman who, when she was 19 years old, went to Planned Parenthood to get a prescription for birth control. During a routine screening, the doctor found a cluster of abnormal cells that could have turned into life-threatening cancer.

The woman wrote: "Early detection and treatment . . . allowed me later in life to have a healthy baby who is the light of my life. Planned Parenthood is the provider I know and trust. Why should politicians tell anyone where they can and cannot go for care? Planned Parenthood was there for me when I needed affordable, quality health care, and I don't know what I'd have done without their services."

That is what is at stake. In spite of these pleas, Republicans continue their obsession with attacking women's health—I would think, by now, they would know better—and co-opting the most personal decisions of a woman's lifetime.

Legislatures across the country, including this one, waste valuable time in pretending to be doctors instead of doing their jobs. Legislators do not spontaneously become medical professionals upon their elections.

These constitutionally protected decisions are for women with the advice of their doctors, their families, and anyone she wants to consult, be it her priest or rabbi or pastor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. What terrible decisions there are to be made between medical personnel and the patient. I don't want anybody to have to say: I have to wait until LOUISE SLAUGHTER gets here because Congress has the last word in whether we live or die.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, this debate is not about any one organization that receives tax dollars. This isn't about Republicans versus Democrats. It is not even about pro-life versus pro-choice. The issue before us today, Madam Speaker, is about defending the most vulnerable among us.

It is about a fundamental question: Will we allow and, indeed, give the people's money to an organization that takes a tiny baby outside the womb—with a beating heart, with lungs that function—and takes a scalpel and cuts open the head so that the brain can be extracted and sold for profit?

That is gruesome—I am sorry—but watch the video. Or are we going to

say: Let's suspend the funding to this organization while we investigate? That is a reasonable position.

Any organization that receives Federal funds and that is being investigated for breaking the law ought to have its funds suspended.

My wife, Renee, and I are expecting our first child in just a matter of days. So this is an issue that is very personal to me.

I would just say to my colleagues: Let's support this legislation and make sure that no baby is ever again cut into pieces and sold for scrap parts in this country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to stand with millions of American women and men who receive essential health services from Planned Parenthood.

These attacks against Planned Parenthood threaten access to health care across this country, particularly for low-income women and men who already face barriers to access.

For many of our Nation's underserved populations, Planned Parenthood is the only source for vital services, such as contraceptive services and counseling and breast and cervical cancer screenings.

If the majority succeeds in its effort to defund Planned Parenthood, millions of Americans will be stripped of access to health care, in turn, creating hardships for American families.

More troubling still is the majority's willingness to shut down the government in order to deny health care to millions of women. Women's health should not be used as a bargaining chip for political messaging.

I urge my colleagues to put aside partisan politics driven by purposefully misleading videos. Attacking Planned Parenthood is a dangerous distraction to the real issues facing American women and families.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3134, to defund Planned Parenthood, and H.R. 3504, which requires that babies born alive during abortions get the same medical treatment as any other child.

It is crucial that we stand for those who cannot speak for themselves: the unborn. These bills are critical to curtailing the horrific practices that include harvesting fetal tissue while babies are still alive.

We, as Americans, value human life. We are fighting terrorists in Iran because we value the lives of people. Fighting for the unborn is no different.

I demand a full investigation into Planned Parenthood's donation of fetal tissue and the removal of taxpayer funding for the organization.

My colleagues will try to distract, distort, and divide us into thinking that this is all about women's health issues. This is, in fact, about saving American lives.

Let me remind my colleagues that Black Americans make up 12 percent of the population and that the fetuses that are being aborted make up 78 percent of who is being aborted.

We must act to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I know my job. Please do yours.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, there are two issues that are very contentious: abortion and fetal research. I support the right of a woman to choose. I support medical research that is legal under our laws so we can get cures for diseases like Alzheimer's and diabetes. I also respect those who disagree with me, but this bill is terrible.

Here is why: It is unfair to women who are not part of this debate and whose access to Planned Parenthood is about getting preventive health care, 16,000 women in our State. The second reason is that this bill, as designed, is destructive to the institution we represent.

Here is how it is designed: One, take the money away and then investigate. In a fair society, we do it the opposite way.

Second, it eliminates access to care for innocent people, who have nothing to do with this, as I mentioned, 16,000 in Vermont.

Three, it is a prelude to the shutdown, resorting to the tactic of, unless you get your way, we are shutting down the entire government.

Four, it is part of the "dump the Speaker" campaign, as though, if the Speaker resists a shutdown, his job should be taken away.

Bad for women. Bad for the institution.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I stand today in support of the innocent and the unborn. I strongly believe now is the time for Congress to stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves.

The videos that have been released that expose the appalling acts committed by Planned Parenthood are horrifying.

These are despicable acts that are on par with the sickest of criminals who are behind bars, and that is exactly where these people belong: in prison, behind bars. These videos have given everyone insight into the inexcusable and horrific culture at Planned Parenthood.

Taxpayer funds should never be used to fund or to offset the cost of providing abortions; and it is especially unacceptable when these illegal and

horrific practices, like the selling and trafficking of unborn fetal tissue, are happening.

As a father and a grandfather, I believe we must seek justice for these crimes that have been committed.

I urge Federal law enforcement to execute a full criminal investigation into these alleged actions by Planned Parenthood.

These two bills being debated today, of which I am a cosponsor, are the necessary next steps. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to support life.

□ 1400

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, let's be clear. This is not a debate about abortion. There are different points of view on that question, but it is a settled question by the U.S. Supreme Court. Those who want to make this about something that it is not need to look at the legislation that they are supporting.

This is about whether or not families have access through Planned Parenthood to preventative health care, to lifesaving cancer screenings, to basic health care that ought to be available in every possible way. This bill would have an extreme and devastating impact on access to those fundamental services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Here we are, 7 legislative days before this government shuts down; and what is preoccupying the floor of the House of Representatives today? An ideological debate that everyone on both sides of the aisle acknowledges will not become law.

Everyone acknowledges it will not become law, but we are taking time to pander to some of the voices that simply oppose women's healthcare choices instead of taking up the questions that the American people sent us here to do. Where is the budget? Where are the budget negotiations? Where is the discussion about roads and bridges?

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, no taxpayer should be forced to fund an organization that aborts more than 350,000 unborn babies every year. This is a commonsense truth that even pro-abortion activists have a hard time arguing.

Guess what—they changed the argument. They pretend that abortion doesn't exist and that Planned Parenthood is the only place where low-income women can get health care. Taking away taxpayer funding from Planned Parenthood means denying women access to health care, they say.

That is untrue, and anybody spreading that should be ashamed. There are more than 13,000 federally qualified and rural health centers throughout this country offering low-cost health care

to women. They outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics 20 to 1.

If this was really about making sure women had access to health care, we could all agree right now that supporting these community health centers is the right thing to do; but that is not what this is about.

It is because community health centers don't perform abortions; Planned Parenthood does. That is what this is about. It is about preserving a pipeline of funding to the Nation's largest abortion provider. We all get this. Let's drop the phony women's health charade.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. With this bill, the majority has declared war on the health and well-being of millions of women.

Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million Americans every year with life-saving services, like pap tests, breast exams, screenings for sexually transmitted infections. For many low-income families, Planned Parenthood is their only option.

The majority claims that other clinics can take up the slack, but just listen to Dr. Mark DeFrancesco, the president of the American Congress of OB/GYNs: "If Planned Parenthood went away, there are a good number of patients just in my service area that no longer will have a doctor. If they start calling my office, it is going to be 'we could take you, but it might be 2, 3 months down the road.' And if they call at other places, it might be 'we can't even take you.'"

This bill creates chaos, and in that chaos, people's lives will be put at risk. This bill is spiteful; it is mean spirited, and it is cruel. It tells millions of low-income Americans: Forget your health. You can just die.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, there are many more options for women's health care than the discredited abortion provider, Planned Parenthood.

While Planned Parenthood is only approximately 665 clinics, federally qualified health centers, FQHCs, and rural health centers, RHCs, provide over 13,000 publicly supported locations, providing alternatives for women's health care. This means there are 20 federally funded comprehensive care clinics for every one Planned Parenthood.

This bill does not change the availability of funds for women's health. It simply establishes a safeguard so that the Nation's largest abortion chain is not the one providing such services.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, there comes a time when we must face the truth, regardless of how disgusting or offensive that truth is. As much as we dislike where we are and the shame

the harvesting of baby parts has brought on our Nation, we are the ones who must face this truth and take action.

Some who oppose this bill and other actions this Congress may take state that defunding this or other organizations will not completely stop these horrific acts, and that may be true.

Did our involvement in World War II against Hitler end anti-Semitism? No, it didn't. Did our government's decision to take out Osama bin Laden end terrorism? No, it didn't. How many innocent lives were spared because we did take action?

The question before us is not whether our actions will stop this evil, but if this government will continue to fund it, sanction it, and tolerate it.

For years, William Wilberforce fought against the evil of slavery, and he challenged his fellow countrymen with these words: "You may choose to look the other way, but you can never say that you did not know."

If we know the truth, which we do, and decide not to respond, we will, in part, share the blame, share the responsibility, and share in the judgment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

These bills today are the direct result of a series of videos that have been found to be purposefully misleading, alleging misdeeds that never happened that will result in the punishment of millions of women who have absolutely nothing to do with it.

In many areas of this country, Planned Parenthood clinics are one of the few affordable healthcare options for women.

During the Senate debate on defunding, a letter was introduced from California's community health centers, stating in no uncertain terms that defunding the Planned Parenthood clinics would place untenable stress on the community healthcare providers, but our Republican colleagues are indifferent to the experts.

Truth, as usual, is the first casualty when they wage their cultural wars; and all that matters is the theater, their bizarre kabuki theater, of ritualized outrage.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank VIRGINIA FOXX, who is a tremendous leader for life and a great leader in this Congress, for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN said we are wasting our time. Mr. KILDEE talked about pandering, which I think is an insult.

I would just like to ask Mr. MCGOVERN: Yes or no, has the gentleman watched the videos?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The gentleman has?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Okay. It is disappointing then that the gentleman is not moved to compassion over the terrible inhumanity displayed on those videos by the Planned Parenthood personnel.

Madam Speaker, human dismemberment is a painful and absolutely frightening way for anyone to die, but in Planned Parenthood clinics across the country, such violence against children is commonplace.

Subsidized by half-a-billion dollars annually, Planned Parenthood kills a baby every 2 minutes, snuffing out the lives of over 57 million infants since 1973, a staggering loss of life, a staggering loss of children.

Madam Speaker, now, because of undercover videos by The Center for Medical Progress, we know Planned Parenthood is also trafficking in baby parts, turning babies into human guinea pigs while making the abortion industry even richer than before.

Although much of the media continues to ignore this scandal, Planned Parenthood's meticulously crafted facade of care and compassion has been shredded. Caught on tape, Planned Parenthood's top leadership, not interns or lower-level employees, show callous disregard for children's lives while gleefully calculating the financial gain.

This begs the question: Do Americans really know what horrors are done to children in Planned Parenthood clinics? Have congressional colleagues and has President Obama watched the videos yet?

In one clip, Dr. Deborah Nucatola, senior director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America's Medical Services and a late-term abortionist herself says on camera:

We have been very good at getting heart, lung, liver because we know that, I am not going to crush that part. I am going to basically crush below, I am going to crush above, and I am going to see if I can get it all intact. . . . I would say a lot of people want liver; and for that reason, most providers will do this case under ultrasound guidance, so they will know where they are putting their forceps.

In other words, crush the baby to death, but do it in a way that preserves organs and body parts for sale.

Planned Parenthood's medical directors council president, Dr. Mary Gatter, appears on the video nonchalantly talking about utilizing "less crunchy" abortion methods, again, to preserve body parts.

Regarding the price tag for baby body parts, she says, "Let me just figure out what others are getting and, if this is in the ballpark, then, it is fine. If it is still low, we can bump it up," that is, the price. "I want a Lamborghini," she says.

Planned Parenthood's national director for the Consortium of Abortion Providers, Deborah VanDerhei, says, "We are just trying to figure out as an industry"—abortion is an industry—"how we are going to manage remuneration because the headlines would be a disaster"—concern for making money and avoiding bad press, no concern whatsoever for the child victim.

Holly O'Donnell, a tissue procurement technician for StemExpress, a biotech company that partners with Planned Parenthood, says some women undergoing abortions did not give consent for these baby body parts to be trafficked.

She says on the video, "Pregnancy tests are potential pregnancies, therefore, potential specimens." They think of the pregnancy test as a way of getting more specimens, so it is just taking advantage of the opportunity.

O'Donnell also says how her supervisor told her to cut through the face of a baby in order to get brain tissue. "She gave me the scissors and told me that I had to cut down the middle of the face. I can't even describe what that feels like," she says on tape.

H.R. 3134, made in order under this rule, authored by an extraordinarily caring and compassionate Member of Congress, DIANE BLACK of Tennessee, places a yearlong moratorium on funding for Planned Parenthood and redirects withheld monies to other facilities that provide women's health.

Madam Speaker, the videos have also brought into sharp focus the fact that some babies actually survive abortions.

Dr. Savita Ginde, vice president and medical director of Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains, confesses:

Sometimes we get—if someone delivers before we get to see them for a procedure then they, the baby, are intact.

That means born alive. That means born alive.

"The fetus just fell out," she says. It just fell out. It, the baby, fell out. What happens to that baby? Tragically, we know what happens. They are killed, and some of their organs are stolen.

The second bill made in order by the rule—the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, authored by pro-life champion TRENT FRANKS—simply says any child who survives an abortion must be given the same care as any other premature baby born at the same gestational age. The new bill builds on the landmark Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, authored by STEVE CHABOT, by ending important enforcement prohibitions.

I would remind my colleagues that it was just 2 years ago that the infamous Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of killing children, as well as women in his clinics, but children who were born alive after an attempted abortion.

The grand jury report describes his practice—and I read the entire report; you ought to read it—Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies he

delivered. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." He called it "snipping."

Support these two bills, I say to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, human dismemberment is a painful and absolutely frightening way for anyone to die but in Planned Parenthood clinics across the country, such violence against children is commonplace and usual.

Subsidized by half a billion taxpayer dollars annually, Planned Parenthood kills a baby every two minutes, snuffing out the lives of over seven million infants since 1973—a staggering loss of children.

Now, because of undercover videos by the Center for Medical Progress, we know Planned Parenthood is also trafficking in baby body parts—turning babies into human guinea pigs while making the abortion industry even richer than before.

Although much of the media continues to ignore this scandal, Planned Parenthood's meticulously crafted façade of care and compassion has been shredded. Caught on tape, Planned Parenthood's top leadership—not interns or lower level employees—show callous disregard for children's lives while gleefully calculating the financial gain.

Which begs the question: do Americans really know what horrors are done to children in Planned Parenthood clinics? Have congressional colleagues—has President Obama—watched the videos yet?

In one clip, Dr. Deborah Nucatola, Senior Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America's Medical Services and a late term abortionist herself says on camera: "We have been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, I am not going to crush that part. I am going to basically crush below, I am going to crush above, and I am going to see if I can get it all intact . . . I would say a lot of people want liver; and for that reason, most providers will do this case under ultrasound guidance, so they will know where they are putting their forceps."

In other words, crush the baby to death, but do it in a way that preserves organs and body parts for sale.

Planned Parenthood Medical Directors' Council President Dr. Mary Gatter appears on a video nonchalantly talking about utilizing a "less crunchy" abortion method—again to preserve baby body parts. Regarding the pricetag for baby body parts she says: "let me just figure out what others are getting, and if this is in the ballpark, then its fine, if it's still low, then we can bump it up. I want a Lamborghini."

Planned Parenthood's National Director for the Consortium of Abortion Providers Deborah VanDerhei says "we're just trying to figure out as an industry . . . how we're going to manage remuneration because the headlines would be a disaster". Concern for making money and avoiding bad press—no concern whatsoever for the child victim.

Holly O'Donnell, a tissue procurement technician for StemExpress, a biotech company that partners with Planned Parenthood says some women undergoing abortions did not give consent: ". . ." there were times when they would just take (the body parts) what they wanted. And these mothers didn't know. On the video, Ms. O'Donnell says: "Pregnancy tests are potential pregnancies, therefore potential specimens. So it's just taking advantage of the opportunities."

O'Donnell also tells how her supervisor told her to cut through the face of a baby in order to get brain tissue. "She gave me the scissors and told me that I had to cut down the middle of the face. I can't even describe what that feels like" she says.

H.R. 3134 authored by an extraordinarily caring and compassionate Member of Congress DIANE BLACK of Tennessee places a yearlong moratorium on funding to Planned Parenthood and redirects withheld monies to other facilities that provide women's health.

At the instruction of Speaker BOEHNER, several committees of congress have launched probes into this baby body parts trafficking scandal.

I suspect that if the President watches at least one of the videos, he'd at least demand real answers concerning Planned Parenthood's inhumane behavior. Or at least I hope he would.

Mr. Speaker, the videos have again brought into sharp focus the fact that some babies actually survive abortion.

Dr. Savita Ginde, Vice President and Medical Director of Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains confesses that "Sometimes, we get—if someone delivers before we get to see them for a procedure then they (the baby) are in intact . . ." A fetal tissue broker describes watching a "fetus . . . just fell out."

It just fell out. It, the baby, fell out, she says. And then what happened to that baby?

Tragically, we know what happens to these victimized babies—they are killed and some have their organs stolen.

So the second bill made in order by the rule—The Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (H.R. 3504)—authored by pro-life champion Trent Franks, simply says any child who survives an abortion must be given the same care as any other premature baby born at the same gestational age. The new bill builds on the landmark Born Alive Infant Protection Act of 2002 authored by Steve Chabot by adding important enforcement provisions.

I would remind my colleagues that it was just two years ago the infamous Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murder for killing children who were born alive after an attempted abortion. The Grand Jury report described his practices, "Gosnell had a simple solution for the unwanted babies he delivered: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors into the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called that "snipping."

Gosnell's grisly after-birth abortion practices were only exposed when he was investigated for illegal drug charges and, in the words of the Grand Jury "the search team discovered fetal remains haphazardly stored throughout the clinic—in bags, milk jugs, orange juice cartons, and even in cat-food containers. Some fetal remains were in a refrigerator, others were frozen."

Last week Gianna Jessen an abortion survivor, told the House Judiciary Committee:

"My biological mother was seven and a half months pregnant when she went to Planned Parenthood, who advised her to have a late-term saline abortion.

"This method of abortion burns the baby inside and out, blinding and suffocating the child, who is then born dead, usually within 24 hours.

"Instead of dying, after 18 hours of being burned in my mother's womb, I was delivered

alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles on April the 6th, 1977. My medical records state: "Born alive during saline abortion" at 6 am.

"Thankfully, the abortionist was not at work yet. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die. Instead, a nurse called an ambulance, and I was rushed to a hospital. Doctors did not expect me to live.

"I did. I was later diagnosed with Cerebral Palsy, which was caused by a lack of oxygen to my brain while surviving the abortion. I was never supposed to hold my head up or walk. I do. And Cerebral Palsy is a great gift to me.

Gianna asked the committee,

"If abortion is about women's rights, then what were mine? You continuously use the argument, 'If the baby is disabled, we need to terminate the pregnancy,' as if you can determine the quality of someone's life. Is my life less valuable due to my Cerebral Palsy?

"You have failed, in your arrogance and greed, to see one thing: it is often from the weakest among us that we learn wisdom—something sorely lacking in our nation today. And it is both our folly and our shame that blinds us to the beauty of adversity."

Gianna Jesson's reminds us that we have a duty to protect the weakest and most vulnerable.

□ 1415

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just state three facts here: We know that these videos that have been mentioned have been selectively edited; we know for a fact that 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventive care, including screenings for cervical cancer, nothing to do with abortion; and we know for a fact, because it is the law, that no taxpayer dollars can be used to pay for abortion.

Having said that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills. This closed rule makes in order misguided legislation that would seriously limit access to crucial healthcare services, like cancer screenings, and limit access to contraception that would prevent unwanted pregnancies.

We are talking about defunding Planned Parenthood? How counterproductive. In my home State of Oregon, more than 72,000 patients were served by Planned Parenthood in 2013 alone. We are talking about real women and men who received compassionate, preventive care. I have heard from Oregonians like Stacy, who went to Planned Parenthood and got a life-saving cancer screening when she had no insurance.

It is unfortunate that the House is using its limited time to debate legislation that harms women, but it is downright irresponsible to even consider shutting down the government over access to these vital services. There is no evidence that Planned Parenthood has broken any laws.

We have seen proposals like this before. It is time to end these attacks on women's constitutional reproductive

rights. I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and other legislation that limits access to vital healthcare services.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues have asked for an investigation into The Center for Medical Progress, which released these videos. The Center for Medical Progress does not receive half a billion in taxpayer dollars every year; Planned Parenthood does. It is the role of Congress to exercise oversight on those who receive taxpayer dollars. It is also appropriate for Congress to cease funding a scandal-ridden organization.

It is extremely interesting to hear my colleagues across the aisle talk about investigating the creators of these videos. If only there was such enthusiasm for oversight on other issues, such as ObamaCare implementation, immigration executive orders, and Hillary Clinton's refusal to share her actions on Benghazi.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. (Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I would not be here on the floor to lend suspicion to the faithfulness of anyone, but as evidenced by what we have been hearing from our friends on the other side of the aisle, this is nothing but a politically charged debate and an undermining of women's health care.

We made it very clear in the Committee on the Judiciary that *Roe v. Wade* is the law of the land. We know that because the Texas Supreme Court, in 2014 and 2015, rolled back the Texas law that was going to close a number of clinics evidencing and providing for women's health care. Planned Parenthood provides for 378,000 pap tests and 487,000 breast exams. 87,000 women found out they had cancer through Planned Parenthood.

As it relates to the fetal tissue, we know that there are laws in place that do not allow the sale of such, but we also know the fetal tissue research has generated spinal cord, neurological research and cures.

Therefore, let me say to my colleagues, the law of the land is *Roe v. Wade*. This is a protracted political fight, and I would only say, ask the person who filmed these particular videos. He stole the identity of his high school classmate to do this underhanded work. That shows you that this is a political effort.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying bills.

I strongly oppose this latest attempt by the Republican House majority to defund Planned Parenthood and undermine women's right to make their own choices regarding their reproductive healthcare.

Instead of spending time fueling a politically-charged attack on America's leading provider

of reproductive health care services for women, and attempting to roll back women's constitutionally protected rights, this House should be advancing legislation that will reform our truly broken immigration and criminal justice systems.

We are brought here today to examine the practices and procedures of Planned Parenthood. Yet, tellingly, the Majority has failed to reach out or obtain any direct information or witnesses from Planned Parenthood.

The bills before us are offered not for the purpose of exposing any wrongdoing of Planned Parenthood, but simply to sensationalize opposition to abortion and serve as a political decoy to shut down our government.

The United States Supreme Court ruled over 40 years ago, in *Roe v. Wade* (410 U.S. 113 (1973)), that a woman's constitutional right to privacy includes her right to abortion.

Since this landmark decision, abortion rates and risks have substantially declined, as have the number of teen and unwanted pregnancies.

Restricting all access to reproductive and women's health services only exacerbates a woman's risk of an unintended pregnancy and fails to accomplish any meaningful overthrow of *Roe v. Wade*.

In recent years, state policymakers have passed hundreds of restrictions on abortion care under the guise of protecting women's health and safety. Fights here in Congress have been no different.

In my state of Texas a law that would have cut off access to 75 percent of reproductive healthcare clinics in the state was challenged before the U.S. Supreme Court in 2014 and 2015.

On October 2, 2014, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional a Texas law that required that all reproductive healthcare clinics that provided the full range of services would be required to have a hospital-style surgery center building and staffing requirements.

This requirement meant that only 7 clinics would be allowed to continue to provide a full spectrum of reproductive healthcare to women.

Texas has 268,580 square miles, only second in size to the state of California.

The impact of the law in implementation would have ended access to reproductive services for millions of women in my state.

In 2015, the State of Texas once again threatened women's access to reproductive health care when it attempted to shutter all but 10 healthcare providers in the state of Texas.

The Supreme Court once again intervened on the behalf of Texas women to block the move to close clinics in my state.

It seems every month we are faced with a new attack on women's access to reproductive health care, often couched in those same terms.

And in fact we are here today supposedly to talk about the safety of medical care provided by Planned Parenthood.

But we know that's not really the case.

If my colleagues were so concerned about women's health and safety, they would be promoting any one of the number of evidence-based proactive policies that improve women's health and well-being.

Instead, they are attacking Planned Parenthood in a back-handed attempt to ban abortion.

That is their number one priority. This is certainly not about protecting women's health, it's about politics.

Just as the 1988 Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel (or the Blue Ribbon Commission) sought to separate the question of ethics of abortion from the question of ethics of using fetal tissue from legal elective abortions for medical research when laying the foundation for the 1993, NIH Health Revitalization Act (which passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support), we must separate the personal views of abortion from the legal issues of federal compliance.

Namely, the NIH Health Revitalization Act prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is funded or not.

A limited exception, and crux of the applicability issue of legality, lies with the provision allowing for reimbursement for actual expenses (e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue.

Planned Parenthood repeatedly maintains and supports that their affiliates involved with fetal tissue research comply with this requirement.

In fact, of the 700+ affiliate health care centers across the country, only 4 Planned Parenthood affiliates currently offer tissue donation services and of those 4, only 2 (California and Washington) offer fetal tissue donation services—that's 1 percent of all Planned Parenthood service centers.

The California affiliate receives a modest reimbursement of \$60 per tissue specimen and the Washington affiliate receives no reimbursement.

It is worth noting that fetal tissue has been used for decades.

Since the 1920's researchers have used fetal tissue to study and treat various neurological disorders, spinal cord injuries, diabetes, immune deficiencies, cancers and life-threatening blood diseases.

One of the earliest advances with fetal tissue was to use fetal kidney cells to create the first poliovirus vaccines, which are now estimated to save 550,000 lives worldwide every year.

The most widely known application in the field of human fetal tissue transplantation has been the treatment of Parkinson's disease.

Many of our other common vaccines, such as polio, measles, chicken pox, rubella and shingles, have been developed through the use of fetal tissue or cell lines derived from fetal tissue.

When looking at the 1 percent of health care providers involved in fetal tissue donation and research, and no clear credible proof of illegal activity, it is obvious that attacks on Planned Parenthood are wholly misguided.

Planned Parenthood has one of the most rigorous Medical standards and accreditation processes in the country.

It is the only national provider that has developed a single set of evidence-based Medical Standards and Guidelines that define how health care is provided throughout the country.

Guidelines are developed and updated annually by a group of nationally-renowned experts, physicians, and scientists, including medical experts from Harvard and Columbia.

Planned Parenthood affiliates must submit to accreditation reviews that include 100 indicators (or high level areas of review) and over 600 individual Elements of Performance (or measures for review). Half of these relate to

the provision of medical care and patient safety.

Planned Parenthood has strict requirements regarding compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations. A specific area of compliance is with mandatory reporting laws and regulations regarding reporting in instances where the welfare of a minor is endangered.

All staff with patient contact are rigorously trained regarding compliance with federal, state and local laws and regulations governing service to minors.

Violations of mandatory reporting regulations are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

It is no secret that the Center for Medical Progress is an extreme anti-choice organization with a goal of outlawing legal abortion procedures in this country.

To achieve that goal, they have shamelessly targeted Planned Parenthood and the funding that provides healthcare services to millions of women every year.

They continue to use deceptive tactics and secret videos to try and undermine Planned Parenthood.

Just like Live Action, the Center for Medical Progress is not a group that can be taken credibly.

The Center for Medical Progress is simply recreating a history of doctoring and manipulating video intended to create misimpressions about Planned Parenthood.

It is a coordinated effort by anti-choice forces—not only on Planned Parenthood or a woman's right to choose, but on women's health care across the board.

At the same time, national media is reporting about a major coordinated push by anti-choice groups and Members of Congress to defund Planned Parenthood.

This coordinated effort to defund Planned Parenthood is an assault on all progressive health care, service, and advocacy organizations who aim to provide vital care and services to women and men across this country.

The public is standing by Planned Parenthood, which plays a vital role in defending women's health and rights.

Hundreds of thousands have already spoken up, including leading groups and communities such as the growing voice of our millennial generation.

My colleagues should be doing more to connect our youth and women to services that help them reduce their risk of unintended pregnancies and STD's, and improve their overall health through preventative screenings, education and planning, rather than restricting their access to lawfully entitled family planning and private health services.

I urge all Members to vote against the rule and the underlying bills.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire of the gentlewoman from North Carolina how many more speakers she has on her side?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am expecting one more speaker that I am trying to accommodate. However, if the gentleman is prepared to close, then I will do my best to do that also.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do,

I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would treat wildfires like similar major natural disasters and eliminate the need to transfer funds from forest management and conservation programs for fire suppression. It is time to make common-sense changes to the Federal wildfire budget.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the bills that the rule will make in order that are before us today, these bills and others are ongoing attacks that are part of the Republican drumbeat for a government shutdown over women's healthcare choices. It isn't enough to attack women's health. Republicans are now willing to take down the entire Federal Government in their political attacks.

As I mentioned at the outset in my opening statement, the facts are the facts; and I know for some of my colleagues, they are inconvenient and they like to avoid talking about them, but the reality is that these videos that my colleagues are referring to have been selectively edited.

We also know that 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventive care: cervical cancer screenings, important lifesaving procedures that benefit women. They do preventive care that benefits men as well.

It is also important for my colleagues to realize that there are no Federal funds, no taxpayer dollars that go to fund abortion. That is illegal. That is the law of the land. That is the Hyde amendment.

To shut down these important preventive healthcare services, to kind of advance this agenda that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have, which is to criminalize abortion under all circumstances—including, many of my colleagues advocate no exceptions even for rape or incest. A young girl who was a victim of rape or incest would be a criminal if she had an abortion.

This is all about taking away a woman's right to choose. That is what this is all about. Planned Parenthood happens to be the pawn, the latest pawn in this debate.

It is interesting. I watched the Republican debate last night. It was really quite entertaining. I heard Donald Trump and MARCO RUBIO and TED CRUZ say that they would be open to putting civil rights activist Rosa Parks on the \$10 bill, but Republicans might be surprised to learn that Rosa Parks sat on the national board of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the organization that my Republican friends, including the people who invoked her

name last night, are now trying to defund.

This is about preserving access to good, quality health care, and I really regret the fact that this has become such a political wedge issue in this Congress, but I get it. I know where my colleagues are coming from. That you would take up the time of this House to do this, which the Senate won't take up and which the President wouldn't sign even if they did, at a time when we have 6 legislative days left before the Federal Government shuts down, I don't know what my colleagues are thinking.

Part of what your job is is to keep this government running; and instead of doing that, we are doing these right-wing message bills that don't even go through regular order, that committees of jurisdiction don't even have a chance to consider, when every Member, Republican or Democrat, is told you can't even amend any of this stuff no matter what kind of idea you have.

This whole process is disgraceful. We need to get our priorities in order here. We ought to protect women's healthcare services; we ought not to be defunding an organization like Planned Parenthood, which does good work all across this country; and we ought to be bringing a bill to the floor to keep this government running.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question and vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last evening when I spoke on this legislation in the Committee on Rules, I mentioned that this is a very emotional issue for those of us who value life so much. One of my colleagues has already spoken to the fundamental issue of life, but I think we always should have time to talk about our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

Particularly as it relates to this issue, it is the Declaration of Independence which says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men."

Madam Speaker, that is what we are talking about here today. We are talking about what our government should be doing in the light of knowing that the most vulnerable among us are being destroyed, and that without life, there is nothing else.

Our colleagues keep saying there are things that are more important for us to be debating today. Madam Speaker, I would purport that there are few things more important than this debate over the trafficking of hearts and other body parts of unborn children, some of whom may have been born alive.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that this legislation is part of a war on women, but in reality it is designed to stop the war on children that is going on in abortion facilities across this country.

Large majorities of Americans believe their tax dollars should not go to fund abortions. They felt this way even before learning that, during those abortions, children are dismembered and sold piece by piece. It is unfathomable that we have to debate stopping the provision of tax dollars to organizations participating in such activities. It is also unbelievable that we do not immediately pass, by unanimous consent, legislation ensuring that children born alive, breathing and crying, like each of us was on our first day outside the womb, deserve the same medical care that any child born in a hospital would receive.

What is heartening, in the face of this contentious debate, is the principle that the truth always comes out. Abortionists can no longer hide in the dark back rooms of their facilities and sell unborn children piece by piece under an illusion that no one will ever know their crimes.

Our debate today and the videos that have been released have shattered that darkness and exposed the callousness of the abortion industry toward life and the consequences of accepting abortion on demand as acceptable. Both of these bills, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 and the Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, contain commonsense provisions addressing the barbaric actions that have come to light in the abortion industry, and I commend the underlying bills in this rule providing for their consideration to all of my colleagues for their support.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 421 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 167) to provide for adjustments to discretionary spending under section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to support wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments

as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 167.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the *Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives*, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 420 and the amendment thereto;

Adopting the amendment to House Resolution 420, if ordered; and

Adopting House Resolution 420, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution (H. Res. 420) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 179, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—238

Abraham	Grothman	Paulsen
Aderholt	Guinta	Pearce
Allen	Guthrie	Perry
Amash	Hanna	Pittenger
Amodei	Hardy	Pitts
Babin	Harper	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Harris	Poliquin
Barton	Hartzler	Pompeo
Benishek	Heck (NV)	Posey
Billirakis	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Black	Hill	Reichert
Blackburn	Holding	Renacci
Blum	Hudson	Ribble
Bost	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Roby
Brat	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Byrne	Jones	Ross
Calvert	Jordan	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Katko	Royce
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Russell
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Salmon
Coffman	King (NY)	Sanford
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kline	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Knight	Scott, Austin
Comstock	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	LaMalfa	Sessions
Cook	Lamborn	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	Lance	Shuster
Cramer	Latta	Simpson
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Long	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Stefanik
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Dent	Lummis	Stivers
DeSantis	MacArthur	Stutzman
DeJarlais	Marchant	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Tiberi
Dold	Massie	Tipton
Donovan	McCarthy	Trott
Duffy	McCaul	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Walden
Farenthold	Rodgers	Walker
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Walorski
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Flores	Messer	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Mica	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Westerman
Fox	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Mullin	Wittman
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Womack
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Yoder
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Yoho
Gosar	Noem	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Nugent	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Olson	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Zinke
Griffith	Palmer	

NAYS—179

Adams	Beyer	Brady (PA)
Aguiar	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Ashford	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Bonamici	Butterfield
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan	Capps
Becerra	F.	Capuano

Cárdenas	Himes	Pallone
Carney	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Carson (IN)	Honda	Payne
Cartwright	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Peters
Castro (TX)	Israel	Peterson
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Cicilline	Jeffries	Pocan
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Quigley
Clyburn	Keating	Rangel
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Connolly	Kennedy	Richmond
Conyers	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kilmer	Ruiz
Costa	Kind	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Crowley	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lee	Schiff
DeGette	Levin	Schrader
Delaney	Lewis	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
DeBene	Lipinski	Serrano
DeSaulnier	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
Deutch	Lofgren	Sherman
Doggett	Lowenthal	Sinema
Doyle, Michael	Lowe	Sires
F.	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
Duckworth	(NM)	Speier
Edwards	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	(NM)	Takai
Engel	Lynch	Takano
Eshoo	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Esty	Carolyn	Titus
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Fattah	Matsui	Torres
Foster	McCollum	Tsongas
Fudge	McDermott	Van Hollen
Gabbard	McGovern	Vargas
Gallego	McNerney	Veasey
Garamendi	Meeke	Vela
Graham	Meng	Velázquez
Grayson	Moore	Visclosky
Green, Al	Moulton	Walz
Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Grijalva	Nadler	Schultz
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Waters, Maxine
Hahn	Neal	Watson Coleman
Hastings	Nolan	Welch
Heck (WA)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Higgins	O'Rourke	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Barr	Frankel (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Bera	Granger	Thompson (PA)
Bustos	Jolly	Wagner
Clay	Pelosi	Westmoreland
Dingell	Sanchez, Loretta	
Fincher	Smith (WA)	

□ 1458

Mr. MILLER of Florida changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 497, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 497, ordering the previous question, because I was at the Pentagon Ceremony Recognizing the Heroism and Valor of Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Specialist Alek Skarlatos, and Mr. Anthony Sadler. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Steven S. Sandvoss, Executive Director, State Board of Elections for the State of Illinois, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held September 10, 2015, the Honorable Darin LaHood was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighteenth Congressional District, State of Illinois.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Springfield, IL, September 11, 2015.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Thursday, September 10, 2015, for Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois, show that Darin LaHood received 35,213 votes or 75% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Darin LaHood was elected as Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all 19 jurisdictions involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

STEVEN S. SANDVOSS,
Executive Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE DARIN
LAHOOD, OF ILLINOIS, AS A MEMBER OF THE
HOUSE

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, as the dean of the Illinois delegation, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable DARIN LAHOOD, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect LAHOOD and the members of the Illinois delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise, and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. LAHOOD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties

of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 114th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE DARIN LAHOOD TO
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, DARIN LAHOOD is a central Illinois native who was born and raised in Peoria, Illinois. He comes to the U.S. Congress after serving over 4 years in the Illinois State Senate. Before that, he was a State and Federal prosecutor; an assistant United States attorney; an assistant State's attorney in Cook County in the narcotics unit; and a felony prosecutor in Tazewell County. He is known for his work fighting terrorism and making America safer.

On a personal note, DARIN's dad was former Member of the House Ray LaHood.

I would just like to hasten to add that I can't think of a Member of the House that I love or care for more than Ray LaHood. And I just want to say to his son, everybody keeps saying: Who is the new Congressman? Everybody says: Well, that is Ray LaHood's son. Well, pretty soon—I want to make everyone know—he is going to be known for a lot more than that. But what a wonderful beginning.

I yield to my colleague from the State of Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague. I don't have much to add. We are glad to have DARIN here as a new Member of the 114th Congress. Obviously, he is joined by his dad. Also who we had hoped was going to be here—but I know he is watching—is former Minority Leader Bob Michel, who is really part of the LaHood clan, and we think of him as we swear in DARIN.

DARIN has already hit the ground running, and I can speak for all my colleagues here, DARIN, that we will do all we can to help you be successful.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I can't wait to work with him. And I know very soon that former Congressman Ray LaHood is going to be known as his father.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to now welcome the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank Speaker BOEHNER for swearing me in today.

Mr. Speaker, it is a true honor to be here. I am humbled and honored to be a part of this body. And I want to thank my colleagues—Congressman SHIMKUS, Congressman GUTIÉRREZ, and the rest of the Illinois delegation—for being here today. I look forward to working with them and being a productive Member of this body.

I would just like to thank my constituents that voted for me in this special election. We worked hard over the last 6 months in this race, and I am proud to be entrusted with the responsibility that 710,000 people gave me in

my district in Illinois. I am proud of that district, and I am proud of my record in the State Senate. Again, I look forward to bringing the values that I have had in Illinois to this body.

I also want to thank my family. The family is the pride and joy of who I am. I have my three boys up here today—McKay, who is 13; Teddy, who is 8; Lucas, who is 11—and my wife Kristen, who is in the gallery. I couldn't do this without her.

Kristen, please stand up.

I guess I would just say that I look forward to working hard in this body, to meeting my colleagues, doing a lot of listening, and doing a lot of learning to be the best Member of Congress I can be.

I also want to thank my mom and dad and my extended family for being here.

I am proud to be the son of Ray and Kathy LaHood and the values that they instilled in me: faith, family, working hard, remembering where you came from, doing the best job you can for the people you represent, and staying grounded in your district.

I couldn't be prouder to be here today with the legacy in this district going back to Abraham Lincoln; and Bob Michel for 38 years, who I am sorry couldn't be here today. When I think about Bob Michel and think about 71 years ago he began his service to this country on the beaches of Normandy and spent 38 years in this body representing Peoria, and then he, during his time when Reagan was here, ushered in Reagan's values to help change this country, to have that legacy means so much.

I know I have got a lot to learn. I look forward to hitting the ground running, being the best Member of Congress that I can, and working hard for my district.

Thank you very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the whole number of the House is 435.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, does this martial law amendment mean that any bill next week can be brought up without the 24-hour notice that we normally have to read a bill directly to the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the pending proposition.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Madam Speaker, that is the plain language of this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to House Resolution 420 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 187, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—237

Abraham	Gowdy	Moolenaar
Aderholt	Granger	Mooney (WV)
Allen	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Mulvaney
Babin	Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)
Barletta	Griffith	Neugebauer
Barton	Grothman	Newhouse
Benishek	Guinta	Noem
Billirakis	Guthrie	Nugent
Bishop (MI)	Hanna	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Hardy	Olson
Black	Harper	Palazzo
Blackburn	Harris	Palmer
Blum	Hartzler	Paulsen
Bost	Heck (NV)	Pearce
Boustany	Hensarling	Perry
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Pitts
Bridenstine	Hill	Poe (TX)
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Poliquin
Buchanan	Hudson	Pompeo
Buck	Huelskamp	Price, Tom
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Ratcliffe
Burgess	Hultgren	Reed
Byrne	Hunter	Reichert
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Carter (GA)	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Carter (TX)	Issa	Rice (SC)
Chabot	Jenkins (KS)	Rigell
Chaffetz	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Clawson (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Rokita
Comstock	Katko	Rooney (FL)
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Costello (PA)	King (IA)	Ross
Cramer	King (NY)	Rothfus
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rouzer
Crenshaw	Kline	Royce
Culberson	Knight	Russell
Curbelo (FL)	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Salmon
Denham	LaMalfa	Sanford
Dent	Lamborn	Scalise
DeSantis	Lance	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Latta	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dold	Long	Sessions
Donovan	Loudermilk	Shimkus
Duffy	Love	Shuster
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Simpson
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Ellmers (NC)	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Emmer (MN)	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
Farenthold	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Stefanik
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Stewart
Fleming	McCauley	Stivers
Flores	McClintock	Stutzman
Forbes	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Fortenberry	McKinley	Thornberry
Fox	McMorris	Tiberi
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Tipton
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Trott
Garrett	Meadows	Turner
Gibbs	Meehan	Upton
Gibson	Messer	Valadao
Gohmert	Mica	Walberg
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Walden
Gosar	Miller (MI)	Walker

Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

AYES—238

Abraham	Grothman	Pearce
Aderholt	Guinta	Perry
Allen	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amodei	Hanna	Pitts
Babin	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Harper	Poliquin
Barton	Harris	Pompeo
Benishek	Hartzler	Posey
Billirakis	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Blackburn	Hill	Renacci
Blum	Holding	Ribble
Bost	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brat	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Issa	Rokita
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Calvert	Johnson, Linda T.	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Royce
Chabot	Katko	Russell
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Coffman	King (IA)	Sanford
Cole	King (NY)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Kline	Scott, Austin
Comstock	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Labrador	Sessions
Cook	LaHood	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Shuster
Cramer	Lamborn	Simpson
Crawford	Lance	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Latta	Smith (NE)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Denham	Love	Stewart
Dent	Lucas	Stivers
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Thornberry
Dold	Marchant	Tiberi
Donovan	Marino	Tipton
Duffy	McCarthy	Trott
Duncan (SC)	McCauley	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Upton
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Valadao
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walberg
Farenthold	McMorris	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walker
Fleischmann	McSally	Walorski
Fleming	Meadows	Walters, Mimi
Flores	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Mica	Westerman
Fox	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Gibbs	Mullin	Womack
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Yoder
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Yoho
Gosar	Noem	Young (AK)
	Nugent	Young (IA)
	Nunes	Young (IN)
	Olson	Zeldin
	Palazzo	Zinke
	Palmer	
	Paulsen	

NOES—183

Adams	Bera	Brady (PA)
Aguilar	Beyer	Brown (FL)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Ashford	Blumenauer	Bustos
Bass	Bonamici	Butterfield
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan F.	Capps
Becerra		Capuano

NOES—187

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Moulton
Aguilar	Fudge	Murphy (FL)
Amash	Gabbard	Nadler
Ashford	Gallego	Napolitano
Bass	Garamendi	Neal
Beatty	Graham	Nolan
Becerra	Grayson	Norcross
Bera	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bonamici	Hahn	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Peters
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Brooks (AL)	Higgins	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Himes	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Polis
Bustos	Honda	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Quigley
Capps	Huffman	Rangel
Capuano	Israel	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carney	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Jones	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kilmer	Schrader
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
Cohen	Kuster	Serrano
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Costa	Lawrence	Sires
Courtney	Lee	Slaughter
Crowley	Levin	Speier
Cuellar	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Takai
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Takano
Davis, Danny	Loebach	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Titus
DeGette	Lowenthal	Tonko
Delaney	Lowe	Torres
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Tsongas
DelBene	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Van Hollen
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Vargas
Deutch	Maloney,	Veasey
Doggett	Carolyn	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Duckworth	Massie	Visclosky
Edwards	Matsui	Walz
Ellison	McCollum	Wasserman
Engel	McDermott	Schultz
Eshoo	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Esty	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Farr	Meeks	Welch
Fattah	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Moore	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Barr	Posey	Wagner
Dingell	Sanchez, Loretta	Westmoreland
Fincher	Smith (WA)	
Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	

□ 1517

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Cárdenas	Honda	Pascarell
Carney	Hoyer	Payne
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Israel	Peters
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Jones	Price (NC)
Clay	Kaptur	Quigley
Cleaver	Keating	Rangel
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Cohen	Kennedy	Richmond
Connolly	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kilmer	Ruiz
Costa	Kind	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Crowley	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lee	Schiff
Delaney	Levin	Schrader
DeLauro	Lewis	Scott (VA)
DeBene	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Serrano
Deutch	Loebach	Sewell (AL)
Doggett	Lofgren	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Sinema
F.	Lowe	Sires
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
Edwards	(NM)	Speier
Ellison	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	(NM)	Takai
Eshoo	Lynch	Takano
Esty	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Farr	Carolyn	Titus
Fattah	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Foster	Massie	Torres
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Tsongas
Fudge	McCollum	Van Hollen
Gabbard	McDermott	Vargas
Gallego	McGovern	Veasey
Garamendi	McNerney	Vela
Graham	Meeks	Velázquez
Grayson	Meng	Visclosky
Green, Al	Moore	Walz
Green, Gene	Moulton	Wasserman
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Waters, Maxine
Hahn	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Hastings	Neal	Welch
Heck (WA)	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Higgins	Norcross	Yarmuth
Himes	O'Rourke	
Hinojosa	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—13

Barr	Fincher	Thompson (CA)
Clark (MA)	Mulvaney	Wagner
Conyers	Pelosi	Westmoreland
DeFazio	Sanchez, Loretta	
Dingell	Smith (WA)	

□ 1524

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed the vote on adoption of H. Res. 420. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 420, I call up the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 758

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ATTORNEY ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) SANCTIONS UNDER RULE 11.—Rule 11(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "may" and inserting "shall";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "Rule 5" and all that follows through "motion." and inserting "Rule 5."; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking "situated" and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting "situated, and to compensate the parties that were injured by such conduct. Subject to the limitations in paragraph (5), the sanction shall consist of an order to pay to the party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred as a direct result of the violation, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The court may also impose additional appropriate sanctions, such as striking the pleadings, dismissing the suit, or other directives of a non-monetary nature, or, if warranted for effective deterrence, an order directing payment of a penalty into the court."

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to bar or impede the assertion or development of new claims, defenses, or remedies under Federal, State, or local laws, including civil rights laws, or under the Constitution of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 758, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, would restore mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits filed in Federal Court. Many Americans may not realize it, but today, under what is called rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, there is no requirement that those who file frivolous lawsuits pay for the unjustified legal costs they impose on their victims, even when those victims prove to a judge the lawsuit was without any basis in law or fact. As a result, the current rule 11 goes largely unenforced, because the victims of frivolous lawsuits have little incentive to pursue additional litigation to have the case declared frivolous when there is no guarantee of compensation at the end of the day.

H.R. 758 would finally provide light at the end of the tunnel for the victims

of frivolous lawsuits by requiring sanctions against the filers of frivolous lawsuits, sanctions which include paying back victims for the full costs of their reasonable expenses incurred as a direct result of the rule 11 violation, including attorneys' fees.

The bill also strikes the current provisions in rule 11 that allow lawyers to avoid sanctions for making frivolous claims and demands by simply withdrawing them within 21 days. This change eliminates the free pass lawyers now have to file frivolous lawsuits in Federal Court.

□ 1530

The current lack of mandatory sanctions leads to the regular filing of lawsuits that are clearly baseless. So many frivolous pleadings currently go under the radar because the lack of mandatory sanctions for frivolous filings forces victims of frivolous lawsuits to roll over and settle the case because doing that is less expensive than litigating the case to a victory in court.

Correspondence written by someone filing a frivolous lawsuit, which became public, concisely illustrates how the current lack of mandatory sanctions for filing frivolous lawsuits leads to legal extortion.

That correspondence to the victim of a frivolous lawsuit states, "I really don't care what the law allows you to do. It's a more practical issue. Do you want to send your attorney a check every month indefinitely as I continue to pursue this?"

Under the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, those who file frivolous lawsuits would no longer be able to get off scot-free; and, therefore, they could not get away with those sorts of extortionary threats any longer.

The victims of lawsuit abuse are not just those who are actually sued. Rather, we all suffer under a system in which innocent Americans everywhere live under the constant fear of a potentially bankrupting frivolous lawsuit.

As the former chairman of The Home Depot company has written, "An unpredictable legal system casts a shadow over every plan and investment. It is devastating for start-ups. The cost of even one ill-timed abusive lawsuit can bankrupt a growing company and cost hundreds of thousands of jobs."

The prevalence of frivolous lawsuits in America is reflected in the absurd warning labels companies must place on their products to limit their exposure to frivolous claims.

A 5-inch brass fishing lure with three hooks is labeled "Harmful if swallowed." A Vanishing Fabric Marker warns it "Should not be used . . . for signing checks or any legal documents, as signatures will . . . disappear completely."

A household iron contains the warning "Never iron clothes while they are being worn." A piece of ovenware warns "Ovenware will get hot when used in oven." A hair dryer warns "Never use while sleeping."

A cardboard car sun shield that keeps sun off the dashboard warns "Do not drive with sun shield in place." Not to be outdone, a giant Yellow Pages directory warns "Do not use this directory while operating a motor vehicle."

Here are just a couple of examples of frivolous lawsuits brought in Federal court in which judges failed to award compensation to the victims:

A man sued a television network for \$2.5 million because he said a show it aired raised his blood pressure. When the network publicized his frivolous lawsuit, he demanded the court make them stop.

Although the court found the case frivolous, not only did it not compensate the victim, it granted the man who filed the frivolous lawsuit an exemption from even paying the ordinary court filing fees.

In another case, lawyers filed a case against a parent, claiming the parent's discipline of his child violated the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment by the government, not private citizens. One of the lawyers even admitted to signing the complaint without reading it.

The court found the case frivolous, but it awarded the victim only about a quarter of its legal costs because rule 11 currently doesn't require that a victim's legal costs be paid in full. The Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would change that.

In his 2011 State of the Union Address, President Obama said, "I'm willing to look at other ideas to . . . rein in frivolous lawsuits."

Mr. President, here it is: a one-page bill that would significantly reduce the burden of frivolous litigation on innocent Americans.

I thank the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, for introducing this simple, commonsense legislation that would do so much to prevent lawsuit abuse and to restore Americans' confidence in the legal system. I urge my colleagues to support it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was duly impressed with the statement and position of my chairman, but I find it hard to believe it is on this bill because this bill is not a bill that should be passed.

This bill is an affront to the judges of this country, to the Judicial Conference, and to the American Bar Association.

The American Bar Association, a conservative organization, has come out against it. The Judicial Conference, made up of predominantly appellate judges, headed by Chief Justice Roberts—mostly of Republican-appointed judges—came out against it because it is not necessary.

It will clog the courts with unnecessary litigation, cost money, and make it more difficult to get your cases disposed of. It is just unnecessary.

Indeed, it would amend rule 11, but in such a way that it could have a serious deleterious effect on civil rights claims as well as to increase the volume and cost of litigation. If this House were a court and not a legislative body, rule 11 sanctions could apply here.

These concerns are not hypothetical. They are based on actual experience. From 1983 to 1993, there was a version of rule 11 that this law would reinstate.

So all you have to do and all any legislative body ought to do is go back and look at what happened in history. These rules were in effect from 1983 to 1993, taking a judge's discretion away.

Judges can order sanctions. They can make sure that those cases that were brought up about reading a phone book and having a wreck are out, gone. They can do that.

This takes their discretion away, and they have got to give costs and compensation to the other side's lawyers. And then there are hearings and all of that stuff.

Presently, the court has discretion, and there is a 21-day safe harbor provision where an attorney can withdraw or correct any alleged submissions that were wrong.

This requires the courts to award reasonable attorneys' fees and other costs. It does not leave it to the discretion of the court.

Currently, such awards are entirely at the court's discretion, and they are limited to deterrence purposes, not for the compensation of lawyers.

Simply put, H.R. 758 will have a deleterious impact on the administration of justice for these reasons:

First, civil rights. Think about *Brown v. Board of Education*. When it came before the court, it was a novel case, and a judge in certain places, especially in the South in 1954, might have said: Sorry, lawyer. You are out of here.

The judge would have had no option under this but to grant costs against the attorney who brought the case, Mr. Marshall, and we might not have ever had *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Civil rights cases comprise 11 percent of Federal cases filed, but more than 22 percent of the cases in which sanctions have been imposed for civil rights cases. H.R. 758 would restore this problem. Just imagine that result. There are other cases that are similar.

The legal arguments in landmark cases where certain novel arguments are made that are not based on then-existing law would be affected. Litigation would be prolonged and may be too expensive to continue.

Secondly, H.R. 758 will also substantially increase the amount, cost, and intensity of litigation. Experts in civil procedure are virtually unanimous on this point.

By making sanctions mandatory and having no safe harbor, the 1983 rule spawned a "cottage industry" of litigation. There were financial incentives to file rule 11s.

Prior to the 1983 rule taking effect—this really gets me—there had been

only 19 rule 11 proceedings over the course of 45 years, but in the decade that this rule was in effect, which this bill wants to reinstate, there were 7,000 proceedings in 10 years—11 in 45 years and 7,000 in 10 years. So we are talking about a lot of litigation and clogging up of the courts.

One-third of all Federal lawsuits were burdened by these satellite litigations that came about because of this rule. It strips the judiciary of discretion, and it utterly ignores the thorough process by which the Federal court rules are usually amended.

H.R. 758 overrides this judicial independence by removing the discretion to impose sanctions and to determine which sanctions might be appropriate. It circumvents the painstakingly thorough Rules Enabling Act process that Congress itself established 80 years ago.

The 1993 amendments to rule 11 have been a tremendous success. That is what this would throw out. As documented by the Judicial Conference of the United States, these amendments resulted in a "marked decline in rule 11 satellite litigation without any noticeable increase in frivolous filings."

H.R. 758, however, would undo this. That is why the American Bar Association and the Judicial Conference oppose it.

It is also opposed by the Alliance for Justice, the Center for Justice & Democracy, the Consumer Federation of America, the Consumers Union, and Public Citizen.

This is a deeply flawed bill that addresses a nonexistent problem. We have this bill, and we have a bill on abortion. It seems like today's actions in Congress are Shakespearean, first, "kill the lawyers," but, this time, it is "kill the judges." The other one is "kill the doctors."

Congress knows the answer. We can tell the judges what they need to do because they are not doing it, and we will tell the doctors what they need to do, and we will tell the women what they need to do. Unfortunately, that is what we have come down to, a bad bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that no judges have to find a frivolous lawsuit to be a frivolous lawsuit. They have that discretion in every case.

But once they find it to be a frivolous lawsuit, it is injustice to not award attorneys' fees under rule 11 to those who have been wronged by being the victims of a frivolous lawsuit.

What about the burden on the court?

When the mandatory rule 11 sanction provision was in effect for almost 10 years between 1983 and 1993, the number of rule 11 court proceedings was easily manageable by the courts.

The number of rule 11 court proceedings during that time amounted to 7.5 reported rule 11 cases per Federal district court per year, or one reported decision for each Federal district court

judge per year, one per judge per year. That is not an unreasonable burden on our Federal judiciary to see justice done.

Quite frankly, if that were done more often today, we would see a lot fewer frivolous lawsuits to begin with and, therefore, fewer requests for attorneys' fees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the author of the legislation, the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and the current chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for bringing this legislation to the House floor.

I appreciate all of his efforts to do so, and I appreciate his taking the initiative on this and on so many other issues as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, known as LARA, is just over one-page long, but it would prevent the filing of hundreds of thousands of pages of frivolous lawsuits in Federal court.

For example, frivolous lawsuits have been filed against The Weather Channel for failing to accurately predict storms, against television shows people claimed were too scary, and against fast food companies because inactive children gained weight.

In other cases, prison inmates have sued alcohol companies, blaming them for a life of crime. A teacher sought damages from her school district based on her fear of children. A father demanded \$40 million in compensation after his son was kicked off the track team for excessive absenteeism. There are many, many more examples.

Frivolous lawsuits have simply become too common. Lawyers who bring these cases have everything to gain and nothing to lose under current rules, which permit plaintiffs' lawyers to file frivolous lawsuits, no matter how absurd the claims, without any penalty whatsoever. Meanwhile, defendants are often faced with years of litigation and substantial attorneys' fees.

These cases have wrongly cost innocent Americans their reputations and their hard-earned dollars. They amount to legalized extortion because defendants must settle out of court rather than endure a more expensive trial.

According to the research firm Towers Watson, the annual direct cost of American tort litigation now exceeds over \$260 billion a year, or over \$850 per person.

Before 1993, it was mandatory for judges to impose sanctions, such as orders to pay for the other side's legal expenses when lawyers filed frivolous lawsuits.

Then the Civil Rules Advisory Committee, an obscure branch of the courts, made penalties optional. This needs to be reversed by Congress.

□ 1545

As Chairman GOODLATTE noted, even President Obama has expressed a willingness to limit frivolous lawsuits. If the President is serious about stopping these meritless claims, he should support mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits to avoid making frivolous promises.

LARA requires lawyers who file frivolous lawsuits to pay the attorneys' fees and court costs of innocent defendants. It reverses the rules that made sanctions discretionary rather than mandatory.

Further, LARA expressly provides that no claim under civil rights laws would be affected in any way, and I trust this will address the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN). I would like to direct his attention to page 2 of the bill, lines 18 to 23, which explicitly protect civil rights lawsuits.

Opponents argue that reinstating mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits impedes judicial discretion. This is patently false. Under LARA, judges retain the discretion to determine whether or not a claim is frivolous. If a judge determines that a claim is frivolous, they must award sanctions. This ensures that victims of frivolous lawsuits obtain compensation, but the decision to find a claim frivolous still remains with the judge.

A report earlier this year from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts found that civil lawsuits increased by tens of thousands last year. Such an increase makes this legislation necessary in order to discourage abusive filings, which further strain court dockets with lengthy backlogs.

The American people are looking for solutions to obvious lawsuit abuse. LARA restores accountability to our legal system by reinstating mandatory sanctions for attorneys who file these frivolous lawsuits. Though it will not stop all lawsuit abuse, LARA encourages attorneys to think twice before filing a frivolous lawsuit.

I want to, again, thank Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this much-needed legislation to the House floor, and I ask my colleagues who oppose frivolous lawsuits and who want to protect hard-working Americans from false claims to support the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

Now, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, similar bills to this have passed in the last several Congresses, and I hope this legislation will be approved today.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Mr. SMITH, as I do for Mr. GOODLATTE, but I would submit that the rule of construction, nothing in this act or an amendment made by this act, shall be construed to bar or impede the assertion or development of new claims, defenses, or remedies under Federal, State, or local laws, including civil rights laws or under the Constitution of the United States.

That is the same thing as the committee having—if they would have ac-

cepted the amendment that we offered to specifically exempt civil rights laws. That was not accepted.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. This particular rule of construction was a bipartisan effort led by BOBBY SCOTT, a former member of the Judiciary Committee, to avoid the problem that you are concerned about, and that is that this bill in any way would seem to dampen or prohibit civil rights legislation.

Again, this rule of construction was put in there to address the very problem that the gentleman is concerned about.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, at the same time, I would submit the rule of construction is not the same thing as if the committee would have accepted the amendment offered that said specifically civil rights laws would not be affected by this because you could still offer a rule 11 under this. It just says nothing in this action will be construed to borrow or impede the assertion.

It doesn't borrow or impede the assertion of a new claim, but it doesn't say the court cannot find a rule 11 violation and then the mandatory imposition of costs would take place. It doesn't do what you are submitting, I would suggest.

The bottom line is the court felt that this wasn't necessary. The court said, in all those cases he talked about that seem so absurd—I don't understand—and particularly as lawyer—why a lawyer would waste his time doing it because there is no chance of success and no chance of remuneration in cases like that.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), who can explain easily and in a very facile fashion why those arguments are not good.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I will say, with due deference to respected colleagues from Virginia and Texas, this is a misguided piece of legislation.

I speak as not only a Member of this House, but also as somebody who has practiced civil litigation for the last 25 years. I have represented companies, consumers, defendants, and plaintiffs in all sorts of civil litigation; and I have done this before and after the 1993 changes that led to the current rule 11.

Where I come out on it is that this really is an attack on the Federal judiciary. Yes, they have discretion on whether to decide whether there has been a rule 11 violation of in initio, but this is something that encourages rule 11 motion litigation.

It encourages rule 11 motion practice, and that is why the Federal judges oppose it. The Judicial Conference surveyed the Federal judges of this Nation, and fully 87 percent of United States district judges prefer the current version of rule 11. After all, it already allows monetary sanctions for silly lawsuits.

I think something of a false picture was presented a little bit earlier, the implication that Federal judges don't have the power to impose monetary sanctions. Court costs and legal fees of the so-called victims of frivolous lawsuits, that is in the current practice of rule 11. They can do that now.

If a Federal judge decides that he or she thinks that a lawsuit has been frivolous and dismissed, on that basis, they can fully award all defense costs and defense fees. As a result, this is completely unnecessary and superfluous legislation. It offends the Federal judiciary. After all, we are talking about limiting the discretion of Federal judges.

Federal judges are folks that are appointed. We work very, very hard here on Capitol Hill in making sure that we appoint only the Federal judges who will exercise good discretion, Federal judges that are completely vetted, who are interviewed, who go through hearing after hearing and are very carefully selected here by the United States Congress.

To say that we cannot and we should not repose full discretion in our Federal judges is what is being said here, and I think it is a misguided attempt to take away the discretion of our Federal judges.

Not only that, it leads to unnecessary litigation. Everybody in court who ever won a motion or threw out a case thinks that the opposition's position was frivolous.

When you say rule 11 sanctions are mandatory, it creates this compulsion to follow up a motion victory with a rule 11 motion: Not only did I win the case, but I want you to pay my attorney's fees and costs.

When you make it a mandatory sanction like this, you create this compulsion to file rule 11 motions, and I don't say that out of theory, Mr. Speaker.

The truth is that we did have, in that 10-year period, 7,000 rule 11 motions. This is the type of a rule that we lived under for 10 years that this legislation would go back to that spawned all this extraneous litigation. You say: Your position was frivolous, so I am filing a rule 11 motion.

Guess what—rule 11 motions themselves are subject to rule 11 so that they could be frivolous so that the receiving end says: Well, your rule 11 motion was frivolous, so I am filing my own rule 11 motion against you.

That is something that happened.

In fact, a United States district judge from the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Robert S. Gawthrop, in the suburban Philadelphia area, he termed that "zombie litigation." That is something that gets spawned by this type of litigation. We don't need zombie litigation in this country.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just ask the gentleman this: What other sorts of legal claims should a victim be able to prove in court—prove in court, but be denied damages by the judge?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid I am not following the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is a simple question. What other sorts of legal claims should a victim be able to prove in court—because they are allowed to do this under rule 11—prove that they have suffered damages in court, but be denied those damages by the judge?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. This is not something that is denied. Judges have discretion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COHEN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that this is misguided legislation.

More ominously, it disproportionately hurts the people filing claims—civil rights claims, consumer rights claims—and it has a chilling effect on legal innovation. It was legal innovation on the part of Thurgood Marshall to come up with *Brown v. Board of Education*. Who are we to chill that kind of legal innovation in this Chamber?

For those reasons, I oppose this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who was not able to identify a single other sort of legal claim where the victim would be able to prove their damages in court, but still be denied those damages by the judge.

What I am getting at is that in no other area of the law can a person prove to a judge that they are a victim under the standards that define the wrong they have suffered, yet the judge retains the discretion to refrain from compensating the victim of the legal wrong.

All this bill does is provide equal treatment by allowing victims of frivolous lawsuits, who prove the lawsuit against them was frivolous, the right to compensation for the harm done to them, just like every other victim of a legal wrong.

I would continue to ask: In what other area of the law can a person prove to the judge they were the victim of a legal wrong and still be denied compensation by the judge?

This only occurs after the judge has already found that the lawsuit was frivolous, which would not apply to some of the great cases through history where courts have found merit to the case. They are not going to find it frivolous.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I

yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer is that, every time somebody with damages proves his or her case in front of a jury, the jury has the discretion to award whatever they think is proper damages. For example, if they accept some of the damages and reject other parts of the damages, they don't award the full amount, and that is the kind of discretion a Federal judge should retain.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the judge has that discretion under current law, has that discretion under this bill, but they don't have the discretion to say they are not going to award any damages where the case is found to be frivolous and, in fact, damages have been incurred.

Obviously, the judge has a discretion to determine what those actual damages are, but he doesn't have the discretion to simply say: I am not going to award damages, even though I found the case to be frivolous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, commonly called LARA, sponsored by my good friend and colleague from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH. The legal system in the United States needs to be driven by justice, not by dollars.

Right now, there are too many lawyers out there throwing their money at frivolous lawsuits to manipulate and abuse the system. No one should be able to abuse our system.

It is simple to file a lawsuit, and you can cost the defendant hundreds of thousands of dollars on a frivolous claim going through discovery and going through all of the legal processes. That simply isn't right.

LARA ensures that judges impose monetary sanctions against lawyers who file these frivolous lawsuits, including the costs of attorneys' fees incurred by their victims. It prevents bad lawyers from using the judicial system as a weapon and provides justice for those who have been abused by these attorneys.

By passing LARA, these attorneys will no longer be able to exert power over their victims with these suits that are not based on facts or in law, but are merely intended to scare or extort money out of the victims.

I remember when I was in law school in Congressman SMITH's hometown of San Antonio, Texas, and one of the professors in one of my classes said something that has stuck with me for all these years about a lawsuit: You may be able to beat the wrap, but you can't beat the ride.

□ 1600

LARA helps with that. You are not going to be able to stop the emotional

roller coaster ride the defendant and his family, his partners, his employees, his friends all go through as a result of the lawsuit that is frivolous, but you will be able to beat some of the cost of that ride by holding the attorneys who file frivolous lawsuits responsible for that. That is what we need to do.

Frivolous lawsuits drain victims of their money and damage their reputations. Let's stop them before they start by putting the lawyers at risk for filing frivolous lawsuits.

In many countries, there is a loser pay system. We are not proposing we go that far here in the United States, but we do want justice for those who are victims of clearly frivolous lawsuits, and this legislation will make sure that that happens. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), who was a distinguished barrister before becoming a Congressman.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is Constitution Day. How is the House GOP celebrating Constitution Day? By trampling on our Framers' vision of an independent judiciary as one of three separate but equal branches of government.

The Framers of our Constitution established an independent judicial branch because they believed the judges should be able to interpret the law without interference. They believed that only when judges were shielded from the influence of politicians and pundits and special interests could they issue rulings fairly and impartially. In short, they worked to create a system that shielded judges from efforts like the one behind today's Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more—I repeat, this legislation is nothing more—than a giveaway to corporate special interests that seek to price Americans out of their day in court. The bill restores a rule, reimposes a rule that our independent judiciary system abandoned over 20 years ago because it unfairly disadvantaged workers and consumers and other Americans that dared to take on big corporations in court.

Our judges put in place this rule—or kept this version that we use today of this rule—20 years ago, and they remain strongly in support of it today. That is because today's rule, Mr. Speaker, gives judges the flexibility to determine when to apply sanctions against attorneys who file frivolous lawsuits.

This legislation flies in the face of our Framers' vision of an independent judiciary. It strips our judges of their discretion, imposing congressionally mandated rules that drove up costs and clogged our courts when these were the rules before.

We don't have to debate the harmful consequences of this legislation be-

cause history has already shown us how the 1983 version of rule 11 tipped the scales of justice in favor of those with the deepest pockets.

Mr. Speaker, too often everyday Americans feel that they have got the cards stacked against them in our economy and in our elections. Let's give them a fighting chance in the courtroom and reject this frivolous bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 758.

This is not an attack on the Federal judiciary. This is an attack on those unscrupulous lawyers and con artists who are bilking the American people out of hundreds of millions of dollars that they have had to earn and work hard in order to achieve. Our system is out of whack today, and today we find our honest citizens exposed to this type of threat. This would take care of that somewhat.

First, I would like to thank my good friend from Texas, LAMAR SMITH, for his bill, which I believe is so important, as many small- and medium-sized businesses like we have in California are hit every year with frivolous and abusive lawsuits.

I would also like to thank my friends Chairman TRENT FRANKS from Arizona and especially Chairman BOB GOODLATTE from Virginia for their leadership on this much-needed legislation.

Frivolous lawsuits have cost honest Americans hundreds of millions of dollars by encouraging lawyers and scam artists to attack honest citizens, expecting that these honest citizens will opt for a settlement. This is what we call a legal shakedown, and it must be ended, which is what H.R. 758 intends to do.

Let us note that giving in when someone reaches a settlement rather than trying to fight people who have more resources than they do, even though it is a frivolous lawsuit, encourages more people to have more lawsuits and encourages certain lawyers to go down a route where they are only aimed at trying to use their leverage against honest citizens to enrich themselves.

I would note that this legislation will go a long way in these specific areas in terms that threaten all Americans, honest citizens, but it especially will take care of another concern that I have had, of course, and Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman SMITH have had, and that is it takes care of patent trolls, who are scam artists who use claims of patent infringement in their frivolous lawsuits.

Other proposed approaches to this problem deal with the problem in a way that would hurt legitimate inventors—this is where we have a little disagreement—but this solution will help these inventors and help all enterprisers and entrepreneurs. H.R. 758, combined with the actions of the FTC

and other States on bad faith demand letters, gives small-business owners the tools they need to fight scam artists, including patent trolls who attempt to use our judicial process to extort America's job creators.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 758. Support those people who are creating jobs throughout our society. Support those people who deserve the protection and are not trying to scam our system.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, should those filing a frivolous lawsuit be held accountable to the victims of that frivolous lawsuit? I think most people would say yes. There are hard-working Americans and small businesses across this country spending tens of thousands of dollars, collectively millions of dollars every year defending themselves from frivolous lawsuits.

A frivolous lawsuit, as it is defined, has no basis in fact or in law, no basis whatsoever. A judge can make a determination—whether a lawsuit is frivolous or not upon the question being presented and yet not award damages even upon a finding of a frivolous lawsuit. That just doesn't make sense, and it is not fair to the victims of frivolous lawsuits.

The bill that we are voting on here stands for something very basic. A judge shouldn't be allowed to deny damage awards to the victim of a frivolous lawsuit. A vote for this bill is a vote to reduce the filing of frivolous lawsuits; a vote for this bill is a vote to protect the integrity of the judicial system; and a vote for this bill is a warning shot to anyone who thinks that filing a frivolous lawsuit is a way to extort money.

It has been said—and I practiced law—what is the nuisance value of this claim? In other words, what would you advise your client to just pay the other side to make a frivolous lawsuit go away because of how costly it is and how much time you spend worrying and preparing?

Lawsuits can be very intimidating to a defendant, and those who have a good faith claim will litigate it out, and the judge won't find there to be anything frivolous about it; but when it is frivolous, those filing it should have to pay. This is very, very common sense.

A vote for this bill is standing on the side of small business and preserving the integrity of our judicial system.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I just want to go back to the Judicial Conference of the United States and their committee on rules of practice and procedure, which came out against this. They were just against it totally. In a letter signed by Judge Jeffrey Sutton and Judge David

Campbell, they said it is going to cost money, going to impede justice, and is not necessary.

Now, we have heard this is common sense and all these frivolous cases and how absurd it is and how wrong it is and how terrible it is. Well, the two judges that wrote this letter to Mr. GOODLATTE and said that this was unnecessary, that we should just keep the rule we have got, that the rule that we are adopting was an error in 1983 to 1993, it cost a lot of money in frivolous litigation, satellite lawsuits, explosion of satellite litigation, and it just didn't work.

Judge Sutton was appointed to the bench by President Bush after clerking for Justices Scalia and Powell. I would assume that if you were appointed by President Bush, approved by the United States Senate, and you clerked for Justices Scalia and Powell, you are not some kind of a big supporter of frivolous lawsuits in the plaintiffs' bar.

The other gentleman is Judge Campbell from Arizona, also appointed by President Bush. They were pretty adamant that this was a bad idea. They took some surveys, and 80-some-odd percent of folks said it was a bad idea. The bar association said it was a bad idea. The bar association had a group of 200 lawyers, litigants, judges, and academics who participated in the 2010 conference at Duke University Law School convened by the advisory committee to search for ways to address the problem. Not one of the 200 people proposed a return to the 1983 version. So 200 lawyers, litigants, judges, and academics met, and none of them suggested this type of bill.

The Judicial Conference, headed up by two people appointed by President Bush, conservative judges, said this is a very bad idea. The bar association says it is a terrible idea. Yet we are to come here and think that Congress has got the best idea, better than all these specialists. That is one of the things that is wrong with this Congress. People realize that we are not respecting logic, expertise, and history.

In their letter, the judges said that this was a return to previous attempts to amend this rule, that it would eliminate this provision adopted in 1993, and their concerns that they expressed here mirrored the views expressed by the Judicial Conference in 2004 when the Republicans, I believe, had both Houses, the House and Senate, but they certainly had the House.

In 2005, this bill came up, and they came out against it. The Republicans had the House and maybe the Senate, I don't know. The bill came up again in 2011 and 2013. So this bill has been here in 2004, 2005, 2011, and 2013, and the Judicial Conference, the judges, the lawyers, and the experts almost two to one have said it is a bad idea. I know it is throwback Thursday, but that is no reason to bring this bill forward.

□ 1615

I find it hard to be against my good friends, Mr. SMITH and Mr. GOODLATTE.

They are fine gentlemen. Mr. ROHRABACHER was here. He is my buddy. But it is a bad bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding.

A couple of things. First of all, we have found in the past that the judiciary, of course, always opposes anyone else changing these rules except for themselves. That is no surprise, that they object to this change that we propose today.

That doesn't mean the change isn't a good one, but that is their history. If they didn't think of the change, they don't like it. Clearly, this is good for the American people because it reduces the number of frivolous lawsuits.

The gentleman from Tennessee mentioned a poll a few minutes ago. I would like, first of all, to mention a poll that was taken when this rule was in effect in 1990.

At that point, 751 Federal judges responded to that survey, and they overwhelmingly supported a rule 11 with mandatory sanctions.

The gentleman mentioned, I believe, a 2005 survey. In that survey, only 278 judges responded. Over half of the judges who responded had no experience under this stronger rule 11 because they were appointed to the bench after 1992.

So the 2005 survey tells us very little about how judges actually view the stronger versus the weaker rule 11.

It is just amazing to me to hear individuals try to justify these frivolous lawsuits. There is no effort in this bill to deny individuals the right to file lawsuits if they have legitimate claims.

But to try to justify frivolous lawsuits and lawsuits that are found to be frivolous by judges, to me, is so contrary to the best interest of Americans who are innocent of these charges. I just don't understand the opposition to this bill.

Innocent Americans sacrifice reputations. They sacrifice money. They oftentimes lose their livelihoods to frivolous lawsuits. I think we ought to do everything we possibly can to reduce the number of these frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I respect Mr. SMITH and understand what he is saying about judges wanting to control their own courtrooms and control the system, but they have the expertise.

The bar association is not the judges. The bar association is against this, too. So you have got the bar association and the Judicial Conference, both of which are conservative organizations, against it.

In the study, yes, some of those folks might not have been there in 1983 to 1993, but they still knew what the rule was and they were able to study and they were able to understand things.

They weren't there when cases were filed. They didn't know the facts of the case. They learned. They have got minds that are capable of absorbing information, analyzing it, synthesizing it, and coming to decisions.

You didn't have to be alive when slavery was around to know slavery was bad. You didn't have to be on the bench from 1983 to 1993 to know that rule 11 was working and that this bill which brings back that old rule would be a failure.

So I think there is deference you should give to the bar association and to the Judicial Conference, both of which have come out against this.

There are motions for summary judgment. They talk as if there is no way to get rid of a frivolous lawsuit. If you bring a frivolous lawsuit, you are going to get a motion for summary judgment. A court can order that. It can find a motion to dismiss. You don't even have to go into discovery.

The courts are the ones that suffer the most. You said that, sure, sometimes the defendants do from defending these cases, but the courts have to put up with it.

The courts don't want frivolous litigation at all. They probably are one of the first groups that don't want frivolous litigation.

I know some people that serve in this Congress who have been judges. They are outstanding men. They understand how important judges are and that their opinions should be revered and respected.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say that sometimes I see Mr. ROHRABACHER and I think about the fact that we have traveled some together. One of the things I have learned on those travels is the thing people in foreign countries appreciate most about the United States of America is our justice system, the fact that you have got a system where you go in and get a case heard. That is one of the things that is best about our country.

What this is about is taking power from judges and giving financial incentives. The defendants have got the heavy pockets, and it will end up squeezing plaintiffs from bringing actions. If they are so frivolous, the judges will dismiss them on summary judgments or motions to dismiss.

The judges can still have sanctions and damages, but just not have all power taken from them. And there are other rules where they can have sanctions if you are just messing with discovery and violating the rules.

I just think this is going to help close our courts, and that is not the right way to go, particularly on Constitution Day.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is

my friend, that I was pleased that he cited as one of the credentials for the two judges that wrote to the committee on behalf of the Conference that they had been schooled by Justice Scalia.

Here is what Justice Scalia himself had to say about this. He specifically opposed the weakening of rule 11 when it occurred in 1993, writing that it would “render the Rule toothless, by allowing judges to dispense with sanction, by disfavoring compensation for litigation expenses, and by providing a 21-day ‘safe harbor,’” entitling the party accused of a frivolous filing to escape with no sanction at all.

Justice Scalia further observed, “In my view, those who file frivolous suits and pleadings should have no ‘safe harbor.’ The Rules should be solicitous of the abused (the courts and the opposing party), and not of the abuser. Under the revised Rule, parties will be able to file thoughtless, reckless, and harassing pleadings, secure in the knowledge that they have nothing to lose: If objection is raised, they can retreat without penalty.”

So I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Tennessee and I agree on one of the great hallmarks of this country, and that is our judicial system. The hallmark of our judicial system is that, when you are victimized in this country, you have a place where you can go and seek justice.

That is exactly what Mr. SMITH's bill does. It allows people who are victimized by aggressive plaintiffs—abusive, frivolous, and fraudulent lawsuits—to be able to get justice themselves.

Because when you are the victim of an expensive, costly lawsuit that can damage your business, damage your reputation, cost you huge amounts of money, you are indeed a victim, if the court finds that that whole lawsuit was brought on a frivolous basis.

And, yet, I challenge again the other side of the aisle and those who oppose this legislation to name one other sort of legal claim—just one—where the victim is able to prove in court their damages and then be denied those damages by the judge.

They have not done that. They have not made their case in this court, the people's court. The elected representatives of the people today should pass this legislation and give justice to victims of frivolous lawsuits.

I urge my colleagues to support this great legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 758, the “Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015.”

This bill is substantially identical to bills that we considered in the 112th and 113th Congresses, and we have considered even earlier versions of this bill going back at least a decade.

H.R. 758, like its predecessors, is a solution in search of a problem that would threaten to do more harm than good if enacted.

H.R. 758 would restore the 1983 version of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

by making sanctions for Rule 11 violations mandatory and by eliminating the current safe-harbor provision that allows a party to withdraw or correct any allegedly offending submission to the court within 21 days after service of such submission.

Moreover, the bill would go beyond the 1983 Rule by requiring a court to award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs related to Rule 11 litigation. Current Rule 11 makes such awards entirely discretionary.

Yet no empirical evidence suggests any need for a change to the current Rule 11.

In fact, there were good reasons why the Judicial Conference of the United States amended the 1983 version of Rule 11. For these same reasons, H.R. 758 is ill-advised.

The 1983 Rule caused excessive litigation. Many civil cases had a parallel track of litigation—referred to as “satellite litigation”—over Rule 11 violations because having mandatory sanctions and no safe-harbor provision caused parties on both sides of a Rule 11 motion to litigate the Rule 11 matter to the bitter end.

The dramatic increase in litigation spawned by the 1983 Rule not only resulted in delays in resolving the underlying case and increased costs for the litigants, but also strained judicial resources.

In light of this history, it is clear that H.R. 758 will result in more, not less, litigation and will impose a great burden on the federal judiciary.

Ultimately, the type of Rule 11 sanctions regime that H.R. 758 envisions will only favor those with the money and resources to fight expensive and drawn out litigation battles.

H.R. 758 also threatens judicial independence by removing the discretion that Rule 11 currently gives judges in determining whether to impose sanctions and what type of sanctions would be most appropriate.

It also circumvents the painstakingly thorough Rules Enabling Act process, recklessly attempting to amend the rules directly, even over the Judicial Conference's objections.

Finally, we know that the 1983 Rule had a disproportionately chilling impact on civil rights cases, and there is no reason to think H.R. 758 would not have a similar chilling effect if it is enacted.

Civil rights cases in particular depend on novel arguments for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.

Not surprisingly, a Federal Judicial Center study found that the incidence of Rule 11 motions was higher in civil rights cases than some other types of cases when the 1983 Rule was in place, notwithstanding the fact that the 1983 Rule was neutral on its face.

Even the decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* arguably may have been delayed or stopped had H.R. 758's changes to Rule 11 been in effect at the time, given the novel nature of the plaintiffs' arguments in that case.

At a minimum, the defendants could have used Rule 11, as amended by H.R. 758, as a weapon to dissuade the plaintiffs or weaken their resolve.

H.R. 758 is a flawed bill for many reasons. I would urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and a strong defender of the civil rights and liberties of all Americans, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 758, the “Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015,” which can more accurately be described as the “Denial of Access to Civil Justice Act.”

This ill-considered and misguided legislation would rescind the current version of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which has been in effect since 1993, and reinstate the disastrous 1983 version of the rule.

I strongly oppose H.R. 758 because it hampers the ability of federal district courts to deter frivolous litigation—while preserving access to the courts—by limiting the ability of judges to exercise discretion in imposing sanctions for Rule 11 violations.

Under H.R. 758, federal district judges would be required to impose sanctions for all violations of Rule 11, even in cases in which it would be manifestly inappropriate to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the reason the version of Rule 11(c) in effect from 1983–1993 was rescinded is because the results of its 10-year experiment proved conclusively that it did not work.

Instead of reducing frivolous litigation, mandatory imposition of sanction actually had the opposite effect of increasing litigation.

Indeed, according to the American Bar Association, “during the decade of that the 1983 version of the Rule requiring mandatory sanctions was in effect, an entire industry of litigation revolving around Rule 11 claims inundated the legal system and wasted valuable court resources and time.”

Studies by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the administrative arm of the federal judiciary, found that the 1983 version of Rule 11(c) quickly became a tool of abuse.

Aggressive filings of Rule 11 sanctions motions required expenditure of tremendous resources on Rule 11 battles having nothing to do with the merits of the case and everything to do with strategic gamesmanship.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 758 would undermine civil rights cases.

During the decade between 1983 and 1993, mandatory sanctions under Rule 11 were disproportionately imposed in civil rights cases.

A leading study on this issue showed that although civil rights cases made up 11.4% of federal cases filed during this period, 22.7% of the cases in which sanctions had been imposed were civil rights cases.

If this bill were to be enacted, once again, as happened between 1983 and 1993, defendants in civil rights cases could wield Rule 11 as a weapon against legitimate plaintiffs, tying up civil rights cases in long and costly satellite litigation on Rule 11 and preventing legitimate civil rights cases from moving forward.

For these reasons, I urge all Members to vote against H.R. 758.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. DELBENE. I am opposed, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DelBene moves to recommit the bill H.R. 758 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not apply in the case of any action brought under employment discrimination laws, including laws that ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

Ms. DELBENE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

The so-called Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would turn back the clock to deter good-faith litigants seeking justice, like women who are denied equal pay for equal work.

The harmful effects of this bill are not speculative. We know this bill will undercut important civil rights and equal pay litigation because it would restore a version of rule 11 that was in effect from 1983 to 1993.

Under the version of rule 11 that this bill would resurrect, sanctions were disproportionately imposed against plaintiff's in civil rights and anti-discrimination cases. The old rule's onerous provisions created a chilling effect on civil rights litigation, created time-consuming and costly satellite litigation, and gave rise to needless delay and harassment in the courtroom.

This amendment would ensure the bill's harmful effects do not apply in cases brought under employment discrimination laws, including laws to ensure women earn equal pay for equal work.

When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law 50 years ago, women, on average, made 59 cents for every dollar earned by men.

While we have made some progress since then, with women appointed to the Supreme Court and to executive leadership roles at Fortune 500 companies, we are still nowhere near the goal of equal pay for equal work.

Just as recently as 2007, the Supreme Court ruled against Lilly Ledbetter, making it nearly impossible for workers who suffered discrimination to seek justice.

Because she was prohibited from discussing her salary with coworkers, Lilly didn't find out she was making significantly less than her male counterparts until her retirement.

The court ruled that she waited too long to file her lawsuit. Luckily, in 2009, Congress intervened, passing the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to reverse the Supreme Court's decision.

Unfortunately, stories like this are not unique. Women still make only 79 cents on the dollar, about 20 percent less take-home pay than their male counterparts.

That is why it is critical that Congress vote for this amendment: to ensure women can continue fighting for equal pay at work.

Because equal pay is not just good for women, it is good for families, businesses, and our economy. When women aren't paid what they deserve, middle class families and communities pay the price.

Families today rely on women's wages to put food on the table, save for retirement, and pay for their children's education. It is estimated that the pay gap costs a woman and her family more than \$10,000 in lost earnings each year, a significant number by any standards.

I recently spoke with a mother of three named Adriana. She told me that, while working her way through college as a waitress, she had to approach her manager after discovering her less-experienced male colleague made more than \$1 an hour than she did.

Adriana said she felt lucky that she worked for a small, family-run business. Otherwise, she might have been too intimidated to ask for equal pay.

She said it seemed "criminal and ridiculous" to pay people unfairly and that lawmakers should think about their wife, sister, or daughter and the effect this financial barrier would have on them. I agree. I hope everyone in this Chamber does as well.

For women seeking justice under employment discrimination laws, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would be a disaster.

Women taking on huge corporations with limitless funds and armies of attorneys will face an uphill battle in court, at best, or may be completely deterred from even pursuing their day in court.

We have come a long way in expanding opportunities for women, but there is no question that we have a lot more to do. We cannot create more barriers to success than women and families already face in America today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion to recommit and support the women and families in our communities who we were sent here to represent.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit must be strongly

opposed by anyone who understands that the victims of frivolous lawsuits are indeed victims.

No one who supports civil rights laws or the Constitution should support the filing of frivolous claims without penalty, but that is exactly what this motion to recommit would allow.

The base bill makes sanctions for filing frivolous lawsuits in Federal court mandatory. Under rule 11, a lawsuit is frivolous if it is presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation if it is not warranted by existing law or if the factual contentions have no evidentiary support.

In other words, a lawsuit will only be found frivolous if it has no basis in law or fact.

Who here thinks that lawyers should be able to avoid any penalty when the lawsuit they file is found by a Federal judge to have been filed simply to harass or cause unnecessary delay or to needlessly increase the cost of litigation or when the Federal judge finds that the lawsuit is not warranted by existing law or has no evidentiary support?

If you think lawyers should be able to get off scot-free when they file those sorts of frivolous lawsuits, vote for this motion to recommit; but if you agree with me that the victims of frivolous lawsuits are real victims and that they have to shell out thousands of dollars; endure sleepless nights; and spend time away from their family, work, and customers just to respond to frivolous pleadings with no basis in law or fact, then you should oppose this motion to recommit and support the base bill, and join me in taking a clear stance against frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 421, and adopting House Resolution 421, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 239, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—179

Adams
Aguilar

Ashford
Bass

Beatty
Becerra

Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cueellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
McGovern
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock

Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmlers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)

Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer

Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Johnson, Sam
Lewis
Olson
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Smith (WA)

□ 1702

Messrs. POE of Texas, PALMER, ZINKE, NUNES, WITTMAN, KELLY of Pennsylvania, MULLIN, and BARTON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Messrs. PETERS and SCHRADER, Mses. KAP-
TUR and VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. PAS-
CRELL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was re-
jected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 497–500, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on 497, 498, 499 and “no” on 500.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the
Speaker pro tempore announced that
the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a
recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This
will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 241, noes 185,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

AYES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cueellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmlers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hartztler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo

Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Love
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings

Curbelo (FL) Kelly (IL) Pocan
 Davis (CA) Kennedy Poe (TX)
 Davis, Danny Kildee Polis
 DeFazio Kilmer Price (NC)
 DeGette Kind Quigley
 Delaney Kirkpatrick Rangel
 DeLauro Kuster Rice (NY)
 DeBene Langevin Richmond
 DeSaulnier Larsen (WA) Roybal-Allard
 Deutch Larson (CT) Ruiz
 Doggett Lawrence Ruppersberger
 Doyle, Michael Lee Rush
 F. Levin Russell
 Duckworth Lewis Ryan (OH)
 Edwards Lieu, Ted Sánchez, Linda
 Ellison Lipinski T.
 Engel Loeb sack Sarbanes
 Eshoo Lofgren Schakowsky
 Esty Lowenthal Schiff
 Farr Lowey Schrader
 Fattah Lujan Grisham Scott (VA)
 Foster (NM) Scott, David
 Frankel (FL) Luján, Ben Ray Serrano
 Fudge (NM) Sewell (AL)
 Gabbard Lynch Sherman
 Gallego Maloney, Sinema
 Garamendi Carolyn Sires
 Graham Maloney, Sean Slaughter
 Grayson Matsui Speier
 Green, Al McCollum Swalwell (CA)
 Green, Gene McDermott Takai
 Griffith McGovern Takano
 Grijalva McNerney Thompson (MS)
 Gutiérrez Meeks Titus
 Hahn Meng Tonko
 Hastings Moore Torres
 Heck (WA) Moulton Tsongas
 Higgins Murphy (FL) Van Hollen
 Himes Nadler Vargas
 Hinojosa Napolitano Veasey
 Honda Neal Sinema
 Hoyer Nolan Velázquez
 Huffman Norcross Visclosky
 Israel O'Rourke Walz
 Jackson Lee Pallone Wasserman
 Jeffries Pascarell Schultz
 Johnson (GA) Payne Waters, Maxine
 Johnson, E. B. Pelosi Watson Coleman
 Jones Perlmutter Welch
 Kaptur Peters Wilson (FL)
 Keating Pingree Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver Sanchez, Loretta Wagner
 Dingell Smith (WA) Westmoreland
 Fincher Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1711

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 421) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; and

for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 183, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—243

Abraham Grothman Paulsen
 Aderholt Guinta Pearce
 Allen Guthrie Perry
 Amash Hanna Pittenger
 Amodei Hardy Pitts
 Babin Harper Poe (TX)
 Barletta Harris Poliquin
 Barr Hartzler Pompeo
 Barton Heck (NV) Posey
 Benishek Hensarling Price, Tom
 Bilirakis Herrera Beutler Ratcliffe
 Bishop (MI) Hice, Jody B. Reed
 Bishop (UT) Hill Reichert
 Black Holding Renacci
 Blackburn Hudson Ribble
 Blum Huelskamp Rice (SC)
 Bost Huizenga (MI) Rigell
 Boustany Hultgren Roby
 Brady (TX) Hunter Roe (TN)
 Bridenstine Hurd (TX) Rogers (AL)
 Brooks (AL) Hurt (VA) Rogers (KY)
 Brooks (IN) Issa Rohrabacher
 Buchanan Jenkins (KS) Rokita
 Buck Jenkins (WV) Rooney (FL)
 Bucshon Johnson (OH) Ros-Lehtinen
 Burgess Johnson, Sam Roskam
 Byrne Jones Ross
 Calvert Jordan Rothfus
 Carter (GA) Joyce Rouzer
 Carter (TX) Katko Royce
 Chabot Kelly (MS) Russell
 Chaffetz Kelly (PA) Ryan (WI)
 Clawson (FL) King (IA) Salmon
 Coffman King (NY) Sanford
 Cole Kinzinger (IL) Scalise
 Collins (GA) Kline Schweikert
 Collins (NY) Knight Scott, Austin
 Comstock Labrador Sensenbrenner
 Conaway LaHood Sessions
 Cook LaMalfa Shimkus
 Costello (PA) Lamborn Shuster
 Cramer Lance Simpson
 Crawford Latta Smith (MO)
 Crenshaw LoBiondo Smith (NE)
 Culberson Long Smith (NJ)
 Curbelo (FL) Loudermilk Smith (TX)
 Davis, Rodney Love Stefanik
 Denham Lucas Stewart
 Dent Luetkemeyer Stivers
 DeSantis Lummis Stutzman
 DesJarlais MacArthur Thompson (PA)
 Diaz-Balart Marchant Thornberry
 Dold Marino Tiberi
 Donovan Massie Tipton
 Duffy McCarthy Trott
 Duncan (SC) McCaul Turner
 Duncan (TN) McClintock Upton
 Ellmers (NC) McHenry Valadao
 Emmer (MN) McKinley Walberg
 Farenthold McMorris Walden
 Fitzpatrick Rodgers Walker
 Fleischmann McSally Walorski
 Fleming Meadows Walters, Mimi
 Flores Meehan Weber (TX)
 Forbes Messer Webster (FL)
 Fortenberry Mica Wenstrup
 Foxx Miller (FL) Westerman
 Franks (AZ) Miller (MI) Whitfield
 Frelinghuysen Moolenaar Williams
 Garrett Mooney (WV) Wilson (SC)
 Gibbs Mullin Wittman
 Gibson Mulvaney Womack
 Gohmert Murphy (PA) Woodall
 Goodlatte Neugebauer Yoder
 Gosar Newhouse Yoho
 Gowdy Noem Young (AK)
 Granger Nugent Young (IA)
 Graves (GA) Nunes Young (IN)
 Graves (LA) Olson Zeldin
 Graves (MO) Palazzo Zinke
 Griffith Palmer

NAYS—183

Adams Fudge Nadler
 Aguilar Gabbard Napolitano
 Ashford Gallego Neal
 Bass Garamendi Nolan
 Beatty Graham Norcross
 Becerra Grayson O'Rourke
 Bera Green, Al Pallone
 Beyer Green, Gene Pascarell
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva Payne
 Blumenauer Gutiérrez Pelosi
 Bonamici Hahn Perlmutter
 Boyle, Brendan Hastings Peters
 F. Heck (WA) Peterson
 Brady (PA) Higgins Pingree
 Brown (FL) Himes Pocan
 Brownley (CA) Hinojosa Polis
 Bustos Honda Price (NC)
 Butterfield Hoyer Quigley
 Capps Huffman Rangel
 Capuano Israel Rice (NY)
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee Richmond
 Carney Jeffries Roybal-Allard
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA) Ruiz
 Cartwright Johnson, E. B. Ruppersberger
 Castor (FL) Kaptur Rush
 Castro (TX) Keating
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL) Ryan (OH)
 Cicilline Kennedy Sánchez, Linda
 Clark (MA) Kildee T.
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Sarbanes
 Clay Kind Schakowsky
 Cleaver Kirkpatrick Schiff
 Clyburn Kuster Schrader
 Cohen Langevin Scott (VA)
 Connolly Larsen (WA) Scott, David
 Conyers Larson (CT) Serrano
 Cooper Lawrence Sewell (AL)
 Costa Lee
 Courtney Levin Sherman
 Crowley Lewis Sinema
 Cuellar Lieu, Ted Sires
 Cummings Lipinski Slaughter
 Davis (CA) Loeb sack Speier
 Davis, Danny Lofgren Swalwell (CA)
 DeFazio Lowey Takai
 DeGette Lujan Grisham Thompson (MS)
 Delaney (NM) Titus
 DeLauro Luján, Ben Ray Tonko
 DelBene (NM) Torres
 DeSaulnier Lynch Tsongas
 Deutch Maloney, Van Hollen
 Doggett Carolyn Vargas
 Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean Veasey
 F. Matsui Vela
 Duckworth McCollum Velázquez
 Edwards McDermott Visclosky
 Ellison McGovern Walz
 Engel McNerney Wasserman
 Eshoo Meeks Schultz
 Esty Meng Watson Coleman
 Farr Moore Welch
 Fattah Moulton Wilson (FL)
 Foster Murphy (FL) Yarmuth
 Frankel (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Dingell Smith (WA) Waters, Maxine
 Fincher Thompson (CA) Westmoreland
 Sanchez, Loretta Wagner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1719

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 179, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—246

Abraham	Guinta	Pearce
Aderholt	Guthrie	Perry
Allen	Hanna	Peterson
Amash	Hardy	Pittenger
Amodei	Harper	Pitts
Babin	Harris	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hartzler	Poliquin
Barr	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Barton	Hensarling	Posey
Benishek	Herrera Beutler	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Reichert
Black	Hudson	Renacci
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Ribble
Blum	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bost	Hultgren	Rigell
Boustany	Hunter	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Buck	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Jolly	Roskam
Burgess	Jones	Ross
Byrne	Jordan	Rothfus
Calvert	Joyce	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Katko	Royce
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Russell
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Salmon
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Sanford
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Cole	Kline	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Knight	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Comstock	LaHood	Sessions
Conaway	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Cook	Lamborn	Shuster
Costello (PA)	Lance	Simpson
Cramer	Latta	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Lipinski	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Long	Smith (TX)
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Love	Stewart
Denham	Lucas	Stivers
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
DeSantis	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Tiberi
Dold	Marino	Tipton
Donovan	Massie	Trott
Duffy	McCarthy	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walden
Farenthold	McMorris	Walker
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walorski
Fleischmann	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Flores	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Messer	Welch
Fortenberry	Mica	Wenstrup
Fox	Miller (FL)	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Williams
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Mullin	Wittman
Gibson	Mulvaney	Womack
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gosar	Newhouse	Yoho
Gowdy	Noem	Young (AK)
Granger	Nugent	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Olson	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Zinke
Griffith	Palmer	
Grothman	Paulsen	

NOES—179

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Aguiar	F.	Cartwright
Ashford	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Becerra	Bustos	Cicilline
Bera	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clay
Blumenauer	Cardenas	Cleaver
Bonamici	Carney	Clyburn

Cohen	Jeffries	Pelosi
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Cooper	Kaptur	Pingree
Costa	Keating	Pocan
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Crowley	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Cuellar	Kildee	Quigley
Cummings	Kilmer	Rangel
Davis (CA)	Kind	Rice (NY)
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Richmond
DeFazio	Kuster	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Langevin	Ruiz
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeBene	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
DeSaulnier	Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Deutch	Levin	T.
Doggett	Lewis	Sarbanes
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
F.	Loebbeck	Schiff
Duckworth	Lofgren	Schrader
Edwards	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Ellison	Lowe	Scott, David
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Esty	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Farr	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Fattah	(NM)	Sinema
Foster	Lynch	Sires
Frankel (FL)	Maloney,	Slaughter
Fudge	Carolyn	Speier
Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Gallego	Matsui	Takai
Garamendi	McCollum	Takano
Graham	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Grayson	McGovern	Titus
Green, Al	McNerney	Tonko
Green, Gene	Meeks	Torres
Grijalva	Meng	Tsongas
Gutiérrez	Moore	Van Hollen
Hahn	Moulton	Vargas
Hastings	Murphy (FL)	Veasey
Heck (WA)	Nadler	Vela
Higgins	Napolitano	Velázquez
Himes	Neal	Visclosky
Hinojosa	Nolan	Walz
Honda	Norcross	Wasserman
Hoyer	O'Rourke	Schultz
Huffman	Pallone	Waters, Maxine
Israel	Pascrell	Watson Coleman
Jackson Lee	Payne	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Dingell	Sanchez, Loretta	Wagner
Eshoo	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland
Fincher	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1728

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PULMONARY FIBROSIS AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, September is Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month and a time to shine a light on a disease that is deadly. While some may not be familiar with pulmonary fibrosis, approximately 200,000 Americans suffer from the disease.

This serious illness takes the lives of 40,000 Americans every single year, which equates to about one death every 13 minutes. That is the same mortality rate as breast cancer.

There is no known cure for pulmonary fibrosis. There is no known treatment to extend the life of a pa-

tient or improve the symptoms. As a result, the median survival rate is just 2½ years, and as many as 80 percent of patients die within 5 years of diagnosis.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to bring attention to this serious illness that affects so many. With more research and a renewed commitment, we will find a cure to this deadly disease, and I will keep working to make this a reality.

CONFECTIONARY INDUSTRY

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the confectionary industry directly employs 70,000 people in the United States and more than 400,000 jobs in agriculture, retail, transportation, and other industries that rely, in part, on the sale of confections for their livelihood.

For every job that is created in confectionary, another six are supported in related industries, which means that candy drives a multiplier effect of 6 to 1.

Chicago was once known as the candy capital of the world. However, due to an unfair sugar program, many decent and good-paying manufacturing jobs are now located outside the United States.

The candy industry is comprised of hundreds of small- and medium-sized family-owned businesses, as well as the multinational companies with global brands that operate more than 1,000 manufacturing facilities in all 50 States.

The confectionary industry is doing its part to help address the ongoing conversation about food and nutrition, policy wellness, and food safety. NCA member companies are providing consumers with the information options and support they need to make the choices that are right for them.

Candy helps to make America just a little sweeter.

WELCOMING POPE FRANCIS

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, next week, the Holy Father, Pope Francis, will make his historic trip to the United States. I ask that all Americans join me in welcoming the Holy Father, both as Pope and as a man. This is Pope Francis' first visit to the United States ever and will be the first time in history that a pope will address a joint session of the Congress.

The Pope's message to fight against complacency and corruption and to help those in poor communities have resonated with the American people and invigorated Catholic communities throughout our country.

I am eager for the Pope to see the United States of America, her people at

work and play, and I look forward to his visit and his words of inspiration to the people's House where the government for and by the people is practiced daily.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. MULVANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares next week to take up a discussion about Planned Parenthood, I want to speak very briefly to what the debate is not about. It is not about women's health.

The proposal that many of us are making to this House is that we simply take this money away from Planned Parenthood and move it to federally qualified healthcare clinics, clinics that provide better services and more services to women. There are 13,000 of these clinics versus 900 Planned Parenthood units, services that go to women that Planned Parenthood does not provide.

Planned Parenthood does not do mammograms; the clinics do. This debate is not about women's health care, and anyone who wants you to believe that it is, is simply afraid to tell you what it is really about, which is whether or not we should give taxpayer money to an entity that sells pieces of dead children.

THE FIVE MERCENARIES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter stunned Congress and the country when he admitted that the administration's \$500 million program to train and equip so-called moderate Syrian rebels had resulted in the training of 60 individuals. The original goal was to have 5,000 within the first year, but they only had 60.

The information gets worse. Today, most of those 60 mercenaries have been killed, captured, or just gone missing.

Mr. Speaker, where, oh, where have the fighters gone? Where, oh, where could they be? Have they gone to fight with the enemy—which just leaves us how many? It is four or five, according to General Austin. Four or five fighters for a cost of \$500 million, is that the plan for the war in Syria to defeat ISIS?

The lack of a plan in Syria has created chaos. Thousands of people have panicked and are running from the Syrian turmoil. The U.S. needs to lead.

Expecting five mercenaries to defeat ISIS is disgraceful. The United States needs an aggressive strategy to defeat the enemy of civilization, ISIS.

And that is just the way it is.

DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. YOUNG of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a father of four, a regular dad who loves my children more than I love my own life. I know I speak for millions when I say that my wife, Jenny, and I fell in love with our children before they were even born.

It is this love for my children that led me to the pro-life movement, to serve on the board of directors of a crisis pregnancy center, to offer free legal services for those who want to adopt.

It is in this spirit of love, informed by powerful life experiences, that I rise today in strong support of legislation to defund Planned Parenthood.

Now, Hoosiers have made it clear. They should not be forced to violate their own conscience so that Planned Parenthood can continue to operate.

Given the light that has recently been shed on Planned Parenthood's gruesome practices and procedures, can we not agree that taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill for these atrocities?

Now, if the best argument on the other side is that eliminating taxpayer subsidies for Planned Parenthood would create access problems, that is just not the case. The 73 federally qualified health centers, 63 rural clinics, and 24 community health centers in the State of Indiana, all of which provide women vital health services without providing abortions, prove otherwise.

Theirs is an empty argument, one I would encourage my colleagues, as a matter of integrity, to put to rest. Let's free Americans from participation in this morally reprehensible practice.

THREATS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to note the extraordinary damage done by wildfires in Washington State this summer.

It is a fact that our climate is changing. We just had one of the driest springs and summers in more than a century that led to trees and vegetation becoming kindling for the massive fires that we have seen.

The largest wildfire in our State's history hit central Washington, forcing thousands to flee and putting firefighters in harm's way. We have a wildfire that continues to smolder in Olympic National Park, a rain forest. From Washington to California, brave emergency responders have spent this summer on the front lines, battling flames, with no signs of abating.

I believe it is time we pay attention to these warning signs. If we want a

better future for our kids, if we want to protect the communities in which we live, then we need to confront the threats of climate change.

INTERNATIONAL COASTAL CLEANUP DAY

(Mr. CURBELO of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Saturday, September 19, as International Coastal Cleanup Day. I encourage everyone nationwide to participate by visiting a local beach and assisting with this special event.

Ocean pollution is a serious problem that negatively impacts wildlife, humans, and our economy, including many small-business owners. Debris found in ocean water and on shores is detrimental to aquatic life and has the potential to injure water sports enthusiasts and beachgoers, as well as destroy boats and their propellers.

In 2012, more than 10 million pounds of trash were collected by 500,000 volunteers in 97 countries. Earlier this year, my staff and I spent a morning cleaning up the beaches on Stock Island in the Florida Keys and saw just how much trash washes ashore.

Unfortunately, this amount is just a snapshot of an even larger problem. Though International Coastal Cleanup Day happens annually, it is important that we make a stronger effort to protect our beaches more than once a year.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, in America, the practice of abortion is now referred to as women's health care. Yes, in the 21st century, even with all the science, we refuse to ask the question: What about the baby?

The cavalier spirit and the cold-hearted callousness in taking a live baby and then cutting into her face to retrieve fresh body parts—can you imagine the national outrage if we were carving up puppies in the same manner?

We don't condemn these young mothers who have been convinced that no other options exist; yet we will be negligent if we stand silent over the atrocities of an abortion mill that goes by the name Planned Parenthood. Whether you are pro-life or not, surely, most Americans are appalled by the idea that our tax dollars are funneled to this organization.

I cannot look the other way. It is my belief, and I am thoroughly convinced that this is no longer a political issue. This is about a human rights violation that parallels other barbaric times throughout history. Ultimately, we will stand before almighty God.

The Psalmist David wrote:

For You, God, formed my inward parts.
You wove me together in my mother's womb.
I praise You because I am fearfully and wonderfully made.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, graphic videos, personal testimony, and verbal assent reveal the true colors of Planned Parenthood.

There is probable cause to believe that America's largest abortion provider is altering abortion procedures to obtain uncrushed baby body parts; is performing partial-birth abortions; and is selling baby hearts, brains, and other fetal specimens for monetary value. This is atrocious.

Planned Parenthood staff doesn't want to lowball fees for baby body parts, and third parties are drooling over intact unborn children. It is unimaginable how one can camouflage the humanity of a clinician's announcement of "another boy" and watch a baby's beating heart just before harvesting the baby's brain to sell; yet Federal funding continues to pour unabashed, unabated into the coffers of Planned Parenthood, America's number one killer of unborn babies. This must stop.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this allotment of taxpayer dollars and will vote against any spending bill that funds Planned Parenthood.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. PEARCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, a nation, like an individual, is judged by the way it speaks for those who can't speak for themselves and by the way it treats those without total capacities.

It is in this regard that our Founders brought this Nation together with the core principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—life being the first of those.

It is a constitutional requirement that I think that we have to speak for the unborn. When we see the atrocities in the videos, the callousness of the organization that is trafficking in body parts from dead babies, we should react in horror and remove the funding for that.

The greatest argument the other side puts up is that they provide women other services. This chart shows the Planned Parenthood locations in New Mexico versus those providing other services. We simply seek to move the funding from them to here.

The coverage from our State is much broader and much better and would be a voice for those unborn who can't scream out for their own sake.

□ 1745

FUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask ourselves today in light of recent revelations: Why does Congress insist on giving half a billion dollars of the taxpayer money to an organization that has such disregard for human life?

Considering the budget constraints currently imposed on our military, why are the American people's hard-earned money being diverted to Planned Parenthood, which reports more than \$127 million in excess revenue and more than \$1 billion in net assets?

When I was back home in Texas during the August recess, I had the pleasure of visiting the Austin Pregnancy Resource Center, a model women's health organization that can and should lead by example.

The APRC does a lot to support women's health and provide guidance on accessing women's health services. The APRC's slogan of building the culture of life is one that we should all be able to get behind, but there are many pro-life women's health organizations like APRC that take no Federal dollars.

Even so, some of my colleagues prefer to continue to send taxpayer dollars to Planned Parenthood, an organization that takes in money from aborted fetal parts, an organization that alters abortion procedures so they can harvest organs, an organization that, frankly, rips off the Federal Government.

Not only are the alleged actions of Planned Parenthood illegal under Federal law, they are morally reprehensible.

I am disgusted that an organization that is involved in such repulsive activity would promote itself as a protector of women's health. It is beyond hypocritical. It is deceitful and I believe fraudulent.

When I first ran for Congress, I promised that I would vote with my conscience and use God's word as my guide. For this reason, earlier I called for an end to Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

In God we trust.

MISINFORMATION ON THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD DEBATE

(Mr. JORDAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congressman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) is exactly right. There is all kinds of misinformation about this Planned Parenthood debate. The biggest line is this: We are headed to a government shutdown. Are you kidding me?

We are going to fund the government at the levels the Democrats agreed to, Republicans agreed to, the levels outlined in the Ryan-Murray plan. We are going to fund it.

We are going to do one change, though, one simple, but important, change: Take the money from the organization engaged in the gruesome, horrific things that Planned Parenthood was caught doing and give it to organizations that weren't doing that and still meet women's health needs. That simple fact. The same levels, but move it from the bad organization to good organizations.

It is that basic. That is what this debate is about, and that is what the American people want us to do.

TAXPAYER DOLLARS SHOULD NOT SUPPORT TRAFFICKING OF ABORTED FETAL TISSUE

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have known for some time that Planned Parenthood is the largest provider of abortions in this country.

What we didn't know until recently was just how vile and disgusting they are willing to be in the trafficking of fetal tissue and the body parts of the unborn.

These actions uncovered from these videos have given the whole world insight into the inexcusable and horrific culture at Planned Parenthood. The heartlessness displayed represents an unraveling of the very moral fabric of our country.

The passage of the two bills before us is the appropriate action to address Planned Parenthood's illegal actions.

Taxpayer dollars should not be going to the killing of unborn babies. Taxpayer dollars should not go to organizations like Planned Parenthood that support the practice of abortion and trafficking of aborted fetal tissue.

I encourage my colleagues to support these two bills and to support precious, innocent lives of the unborn.

DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD WILL HAVE NO EFFECT ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Mr. LABRADOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that this is not simply an issue of whether Planned Parenthood broke the law by selling fetal body parts obtained through abortions.

The real tragedy we are confronted with today is that human beings have been reduced to mere commodities in this practice, and Federal dollars are contributing to it.

I do not want to contribute to a system that profits from someone's fate nor do I want to subject millions of taxpayers to supporting this violation of life.

It is often a temptation to boil this argument down to medical terms and ignore the real losses our Nation faces when we choose to reject someone before he or she has been given the chance to live.

For this reason, I do not support funding Planned Parenthood and its tragic influence on our Nation's future.

Defunding Planned Parenthood will have no effect on women's health. In the State of Idaho alone, there are 76 federally qualified health centers, and only 3 Planned Parenthood facilities. Women can and will receive health care in these facilities.

CONSTITUENTS SICKENED BY PLANNED PARENTHOOD VIDEOS

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, debate over funding for Planned Parenthood has nothing to do with women's health care. I think we have just heard that on a couple counts.

Constituents on both sides are sickened and disgusted by the Planned Parenthood videos, videos that show officials discussing the killing of babies and harvesting of their organs like they were car parts out of a salvage yard.

American taxpayers are the single largest funder of Planned Parenthood, over \$500 million last year alone. No American should ever be forced, under penalty of imprisonment, mind you—if you don't pay your taxes, you are going to go to jail—to support this activity with their tax dollars, period.

I am a husband, a father to two little girls, a son, and a friend who cares deeply about women's health care, everybody's health care. That said, I cannot and I will not support the dismemberment and sale of the body parts of infants.

I cannot in good conscience, I can't in any conscience, support legislation that funds disgusting actions of those who conduct that practice.

THE RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN ARE BEING VIOLATED

(Mr. MOOLENAAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, on social media, a new generation of parents and grandparents are sharing the joy of new life, posting pictures of baby bumps and sonograms for friends and family to view.

Now more than ever, it is easier to see and understand that an unborn child in the womb is a person with tiny toes and fingers and a heartbeat, created equal and entitled to unalienable rights.

However, recent events have demonstrated that these rights are being violated and that the public's trust has been betrayed.

Millions of taxpayer dollars have supported the horrific practice of allowing babies to be taken apart, dismantled, and sold piece by piece.

In response, House investigations are underway, and more needs to be done to protect our most vulnerable citizens.

H.R. 3134 restores trust for American taxpayers. It provides more funding for qualified health centers that offer pediatric care, immunizations, mammograms, and more lifesaving healthcare services that protect mother and child.

These better options are worthy of taxpayer funding and will make a positive difference for women and children across our country.

PROTECT THE SANCTITY OF LIFE

(Mr. CARTER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the two pieces of legislation aimed at fighting evil and protecting the sanctity of life.

I have seen the horrendous videos showing the grotesque practice of harvesting and selling preborn baby body parts that Planned Parenthood executives now condone and encourage. This evil practice must stop.

Taxpayers should not be responsible for funding an organization that aborts babies, negotiates deals to sell body parts, and lets babies that have survived abortion be left to die on the operating table.

As a former judge, I have dealt with countless murder cases, and this is murder in my book. Planned Parenthood received 40 percent of their total revenue from taxpayers.

How much longer are we going to permit Planned Parenthood to murder on the taxpayer dime?

Rest assured, the House is conducting an investigation on Planned Parenthood. We will do everything in our power to hold these criminals accountable for their actions.

I implore my colleagues to support these two bills and protect the sanctity of life before and after birth.

STAND UP FOR CALIFORNIA'S ALMOND INDUSTRY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the California almond industry has shouldered the brunt of the drought finger-pointing over the last year.

The reality is that almond trees use about the same, if not less, the amount of water of any fruit or nut in the State of California.

It is like the old story of the frog in the pot of boiling water. If the pot has no water, then you have no frog nor agriculture in California. We need to build water storage. That said, our al-

mond industry employs over 100,000 people and brings in \$21 billion to the State each year.

In addition to being scapegoats on water, they also face a potential \$4 billion loss if the European Union chooses not to extend the maximum residue levels allowed on fosetyl-aluminum. This chemical is not even used in almonds and poses no health risk. Inaction to extend this MRL will prevent almonds from being exported into the EU, depressing prices worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Secretary Vilsack and the USDA to stand up for California and our agriculture and help obtain this critical extension.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD TARGETS MINORITY COMMUNITIES FOR DESTRUCTION

(Mr. HUELSKAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this House, indeed ask the American people: Do you believe your taxpayer dollars should be used to fund racism? Do you think your hard-earned taxpayer dollars should be used to target minority communities?

Mr. Speaker, I have adopted children. They don't look like me. They look like average Americans of various ethnic minority backgrounds.

Without a doubt, if you look at Planned Parenthood's history, as well as its current practices, they target minority communities for destruction and elimination.

That is the history of Margaret Sanger. That is the history of Planned Parenthood. That is the history that is being funded.

That is the current day practice of Planned Parenthood, to target minority communities with abortion, with destruction, with elimination.

Without a doubt, in my mind, I think in the mind of the American people, it is time to stop funding racism with our tax dollars.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE AN ACCESSORY TO CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there are those who say you shouldn't shut down the government. We are not going to shut down the government. We are going to fund the government.

And I am hoping that we are actually going to fund women's health with more money than what the President or the Democrats were pushing for to be given to Planned Parenthood.

In the history of Planned Parenthood, they have never, ever, ever done one mammogram because they are not certified to do mammograms. They bring people in and refer them out to get their mammograms.

I have been married for 37 years to the same woman, and I have three daughters. I want good women's health care. Let's fund it, but let's give it directly to the facilities that will do the mammograms and not send it to Planned Parenthood for them to take their cut.

When you pay for the rent and the utilities and you know there is criminal activity going on, you are an accessory. Congress should not be an accessory.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my deepest concerns for the health and safety of the women, children, all babies, and families in our great country.

Recent undercover videos by The Center for Medical Progress unearthed some of the most alarming information that has been hidden from the American people for years. These videos deeply disturb me, and I know I am not alone.

The practices uncovered in the Planned Parenthood videos are repulsive. I never dreamed I would be standing before this body questioning if our own government is a willing enabler in the profiteering from the buying and selling of aborted baby parts.

It is wrong that Planned Parenthood continues to do as it pleases and that the American taxpayers are bankrolling that organization. We are spending \$450 million a year funding Planned Parenthood.

That is why I sent a letter along with 134 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives on July 27 that calls for a full investigation into Planned Parenthood by the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for the people that I am blessed to represent from the Second Congressional District in West Virginia. I am here to say that taxpayers should not fund abortions. Supporters of Planned Parenthood continually point to other services that they provide.

There is precisely one Planned Parenthood provider in all of West Virginia, located in Vienna, less than an hour outside of my district, right here. One. Does it even provide mammograms? No, it does not.

□ 1800

However, we have more than 300 federally certified women's care facilities in West Virginia that do provide these essential services. Taxpayers should not be forced to fund abortions through Planned Parenthood. We should defund that organization from taxpayer funding dollars right now.

Senior officials—on camera—were caught admitting to unethical, illegal activities in the selling of body parts.

Let's define what we are talking about here. This is a baby approximately 16 weeks after the moment of conception. Human life begins at conception. This is a baby.

Some would like to define it as something else—call it anything but a baby. They will call it a fetus, a blob of tissue, cells; but they do not want to call this little boy or girl a baby. However, you couldn't sell baby body parts, such as lungs, hearts, livers, as Planned Parenthood was caught doing, unless it was a baby.

This is a baby. This is what he or she looks like. This is what taxpayers in this country—you, the taxpayers—are being forced to pay for, the killing of this baby and the buying or selling of her body parts. That is wrong. That is what we are standing against here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and we need your support in this.

The Federal Government needs to stop enabling this black market business immediately. That is why I have cosponsored several pieces of legislation to make sure that the taxpayers and thousands of unborn children are protected from the activities and horrendous actions of Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers.

H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, simply prohibits funding of Planned Parenthood for a year to allow for a full congressional investigation to take place.

H.R. 3197, the Protecting Life and Taxpayers Act of 2015—this bill will prohibit Federal funding of an entity that performs abortions, including Planned Parenthood.

H.R. 3215, the End Trafficking of the Terminated Unborn Act of 2015—this bill will prohibit any transfer of fetal tissue from aborted babies for a purpose other than disposal. This will prevent both publicly and privately funded research involving the remains of unborn children who were aborted.

Finally, my bill, H.R. 816, the Life At Conception Act, would define life at the moment of conception, which is a biological fact.

The abortion issue, actually, in this bill defunding Planned Parenthood—which our goal is to defund Planned Parenthood—does not actually stop abortion. I wish we could. Abortion is the taking of a human life.

Defund Planned Parenthood is simply saying that taxpayers should not be forced to pay for those abortions. That is a widely accepted view of the majority of Americans, even those who may disagree with us pro-life advocates on the abortion issue. Many people think that abortion shouldn't be funded with taxpayer dollars.

All of these bills are crucial to making sure that the American taxpayer is no longer footing the bill or condoning the barbaric practices of Planned Parenthood or any other organization like them that traffics in aborted baby body parts.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for these four vital pieces of leg-

islation and remove taxpayer funding of abortion in the spending bills before us in Congress. That is our duty in the U.S. House of Representatives.

We control spending in this Chamber. No one can tell us what to do. We represent the people in the districts that voted us into office. I am calling on the folks in this Chamber and in America to support the defunding of Planned Parenthood now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WILDFIRES AND FOREST MANAGEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to wildfires and forest management.

Recent headlines show that our forests are in terrible shape: 8.8 million acres have burned this year; \$250 million was recently transferred from forest management accounts to fight fires, announced last week.

Emergency fire spending has already topped \$700 million this year and is still growing. We have a problem that is greatly decreasing and impairing the value of our forest for the next generation.

I worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, back in July. This bill was supported from Maine to Alaska by Democrats and Republicans. The bill ends the destructive practice of fire borrowing in a fiscally responsible manner. It creates a sub-account under the Stafford Act for wildfire. This ensures that resources to put out major fires are available when necessary.

This week, the Obama administration publicly called on the Congress to fix fire borrowing. While I appreciate the President's interest, I agree with him that we need to fix fire borrowing. I applaud the 19 Democrats who voted for H.R. 2647 that fixes fire borrowing.

Fixing fire borrowing alone won't solve the problem. Fixing fire borrowing alone simply is treating a symptom instead of a disease. It is like putting on a bandaid without cleaning out the wound.

Again, the House passed this bipartisan legislation back in July. We could be fixing these problems now, but

the Senate hasn't acted. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time to stop playing politics with our Nation's forests, one of our most treasured resources. The House offered a solution. Let's embrace constructive governance and make H.R. 2647 the law of the land.

I want to take a moment and look at what the Resilient Federal Forests Act does. We already talked about fire borrowing, but it also prevents future fires.

H.R. 2647 gives the Forest Service the tools it needs to better manage our national forests immediately after its passage. Our forests are overgrown, and therefore, they are fire prone. Fighting fires doesn't prevent future fires. That is why we need better management. Scientific thinning helps prevent future fires.

I would like to show some photographs from a forest in my home State of Arkansas. To some, this may look like a healthy, thriving forest because you see trees and you see a lot of greenery, but I am a forester, and when I look at that, I see an overstock stand of trees. I see too much undergrowth. I see too much dead and dying material on the forest floor. This is not a healthy forest, but this happens to be a control site in the middle of a healthy forest.

Next, I want to show how we get to a healthy forest on this particular side.

This area has been thinned, and there is controlled burns taking place. These burns take place on intervals of 3 to 5 years. They not only make the forest better to withstand potential forest fires; they also create better wildlife habitat. The biodiversity in this forest goes through the roof when these kind of management practices are put in place. We get healthy trees. We get an early successional habitat that is good for wildlife. It also is good for the soil; it is good for water quality, and it is good for air quality.

This last picture shows what a healthy forest in my district looks like. These trees are thriving. This is an early growth not too long after a fire. This is a great wildlife habitat. The biodiversity of wildlife and plant life is much higher in this photograph than what we saw in the previous photograph. This creates a win-win situation.

Now, this isn't the solution for everywhere across the country; this is what works in the forests in my district, but there are forest managers across this country that know how to manage their forests in their particular climate and in their particular setting to create healthy forests and forests that can withstand a fire. It would be almost impossible for a forest fire to destroy these trees.

The next thing that the Resilient Federal Forests Act does is it stops frivolous lawsuits. You may ask: Why do we need to stop frivolous lawsuits?

Well, frivolous lawsuits hinder forest plans that are developed locally, using science, best management practices,

and collaborative efforts that represent stakeholder values. The end result is a forest that is decreased and impaired in value for our next generation.

This bill discourages frivolous lawsuits by requiring those suing to stop collaborative projects to post a bond. If the plaintiff loses, they pay the taxpayer's legal bills. If they win, they get their money back.

This bill also aids in better land management planning. In the words of former U.S. Forest Service chief Dale Bosworth: "We do not have a fire problem on our Nation's forests; we have a land management problem. And it needs to be addressed quickly."

Delayed decisionmaking or, even worse, no decisionmaking at all, is hurting our forests. Forests are dynamic. They are a living, growing organism. When we say no action, we are actually taking action. Since forests are not static, scientific analysis should not be static.

This bill requires the Forest Service to critically analyze the impacts of no action, which often are overgrowth, increased wildfire, and diseases. Increases in future wildfire problems are often caused because of poor land management. It makes it difficult for reforestation, ultimately decreasing and impairing the value of forests.

This bill sets up requirements for salvage plans in response to catastrophic events. It requires environmental assessments for salvage projects to be completed within 90 days so that timber can be removed while it is still commercially valuable.

The USDA completed post-Hurricane Katrina NEPA on the De Soto National Forest within 90 days. They expedited it. They were successful at that. As a result, 80 percent of the timber was salvaged that was in moderate to heavily damaged areas.

The management actions laid out in this bill must comply with forest plans. It is not taking a shortcut. Despite what some folks say, this doesn't mean thousands of acres clearcut. It doesn't mean destruction of snag habitats that often become available after a large fire.

In my home State, clearcuts are restricted to 180 acres, at most. We are talking about thousands of acres of land that still have to follow forest management practices.

This bill rewards collaboration. It incentivizes collaboration and speeds up the implementation of collaborative projects. It safeguards a strong, timely environmental review process through categorical exclusions for forest management projects.

You may ask: What are collaborative projects? This is simply where local land managers, environmentalists, citizens, and industry representatives come up with a plan. These groups spend hundreds if not thousands of hours working on a plan that is best for their local area. Why wouldn't we encourage this sort of compromise?

This bill encourages more collaborative projects. Passing this bill shows

that we endorse commonsense plans that tend to local and ecological needs.

This bill creates greater reforestation after natural disasters. As a forester, this statistic is really disturbing to me. On average, less than 3 percent of an area is reforested after a catastrophic event on our national forests. This bill requires that 75 percent reforestation takes place within 5 years. This will revitalize our forests that are destroyed by fire or other natural events.

When we reforest an area, we have young trees that grow fast and sequester carbon faster than older, fully grown trees. If we want to sequester more carbon, then we should be planting more trees. We should demand that we reforest our land after the timber is destroyed in one of these catastrophic events.

We have to stop playing politics, and we need to pass this bill.

This bill creates greater roles for the tribes. Oftentimes, the Federal Government does not collaborate and work together with those who have expertise in forest health. This bill brings in State and tribal governments as strong partners in forest management.

It gives the Forest Service the authority to accept assistance from States willing to put money toward forest management.

□ 1815

It also reinforces existing tribal authority to assist in the management of national forest land adjacent to reservations.

The Resilient Federal Forests Act modernizes secure rural schools. This is an issue that is very important in my district. We have many rural areas near our national forests, and the schools are hurting because of the decreased funding because we are not keeping our forests healthy.

Rural communities not only depend on our forests for their sustenance, but they also provide emergency services, education, and support for the forests and residents who live near the forests. As forests lose value, communities suffer, and they will only suffer more in the future.

This bill gives counties flexibility to spend secure rural schools funding. It allows them to spend money on emergency services on Federal lands, and it puts 25 percent of stewardship contracts into the county treasury where the projects occurred.

This bill means more money for our schools and other public services, along with the benefits of a healthy and resilient forest.

One more time, I want to look at the fire borrowing issue. This is one of the worst fire seasons we have seen. We know what good management practices are. We know how to implement those practices on the land.

The House has acted by passing H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act. It solves fire borrowing. It completely reforms current bad management practices. And this is isn't just me saying

this. We have letters from hundreds of groups that have endorsed this bill. Here is a list of just a few of them: the Forest Products Industry National Labor Management Committee, the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Forest Service Retirees, the National Water Resources Association, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. There are hundreds more that have supported this legislation because it is good, commonsense legislation that is good for our country; it is good for our forests.

The House has acted. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time for the administration to stop playing politics with wildfire. It is time to make H.R. 2647 the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this subject up. It is a subject that all of us in the West deal with every year.

A couple of years ago, we had Tom Tidwell in New Mexico. He was there at a time when the Forest Service was in the process of burning down 255 homes in Ruidoso. The fire almost burned completely out of control and burned the entire town down. That is what the agency was surprised and frightened by.

These fires are caused by a lack of management. And instead of addressing the problem by reducing the number of trees in the forests, the Forest Service is saying, and Tom Tidwell himself said, that our policy is going to be to reintroduce fire into its natural habitat.

Introducing fire into the forest at this stage, with the years of no attention, with the years of fuel buildup, with the decades of drought that have put them in an explosive position in much of the West, is absolute lunacy. And yet this was the highest ranking Forest Service employee saying that we need to reintroduce fire into the wild.

I am sorry, but we need to clean up the forest first, then the fire can keep the forest healthy—but not until then. These raging wildfires are a natural conclusion to the management policies for the past decades, and so we can't start and act like that policy has not been in place.

Another policy that the Forest Service is engaged in is letting fire achieve management objectives. If I were to take a look at, say, one of the large fires out in Grant County, in the Gila Wilderness area of New Mexico, you can see the daily reports where they are talking about, well, the fire is 300 acres, it is 600 acres, and it is achieving its management objective.

Well, there is one truth about New Mexico: If the wind is not blowing today, it is going to blow tomorrow. Letting those fires go, while they are

supposedly monitoring them, and the fire then gets the push from the wind and grows from 300 or 800 acres to 10,000 to 30,000 acres is, again, a natural conclusion to the management policies of this Forest Service.

It is time for us to revise the way our forests are managed. Mr. WESTERMAN has a bill that is exactly right, H.R. 2647, and we should pass that bill, and that process should go forward.

Let's start cleaning the excess timber out of our forests. It is much simpler than what everybody wants to make it. It is much simpler than the Forest Service would allow.

So again, I appreciate the fact that you are bringing this issue up. I appreciate the fact that you have yielded time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express thanks to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) for leading this discussion tonight. It is very important to many of us in rural America.

Of course, my district, which includes seven national forests, has experienced increasingly devastating forest fires caused by overgrown, mismanaged, or even nonmanaged forests, and has been economically strangled by restrictions on forest management.

Our Nation has already lost over 8½ million acres to wildfire, and the year isn't yet over. We are on pace to exceed the record of 10 million acres burned back in 2006, and that is not a record we want to break.

Our rural communities, public lands, and the environment are being destroyed through neglect. The habitat is gone, erosion into our lakes and waterways goes unchecked, and the people's asset, the value of the trees, is wasted.

In light of Forest Service surveys finding that over 12 million Sierra Nevada trees have died in the last year, we cannot afford to wait another year.

That is why we need Mr. WESTERMAN's bill, H.R. 2647, which will return active management to our forests by increasing flexibility, cutting red tape, and, most importantly, acting to manage forests before fires occur, not afterwards.

Streamlining review process means that forest management can occur when it is actually needed to address dangerous conditions, not after years of legal roadblocks.

Allowing categorical exclusions for post-fire salvage and rehabilitation hastens forest recovery and prevents fuel buildup that can contribute to future fires.

Expanding local involvement in forest management will improve the data and know-how available for planning and also respect local priorities.

Finally, the budget impact of forest neglect can no longer be ignored. Just this week, the Forest Service diverted yet another \$250 million from forest

management to fighting fire. That brings the Federal spending total so far this year on firefighting to \$700 million, money that, though we agree, needs to fight fire this year, could surely be used better if we properly managed forests in the future.

This bill will end the borrowing by funding fires, as we do hurricanes, earthquakes, and other disasters, making them eligible for FEMA disaster funds.

In California, over 1,000 homes have burned. Tens of thousands have been evacuated from their homes or communities. Firefighters have lost their lives, as well as some residents now. This is a needless loss of life, needless suffering in rural America.

Let's start by keeping H.R. 2647 moving in the process through the Senate and on to the President's desk.

I again thank Mr. WESTERMAN for his leadership and allowing me to speak on this important topic here tonight.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support to remind my colleagues in the Senate that the Western United States is on fire. We don't have time for inaction and more political pandering.

The House has passed the Resilient Federal Forests Act, which includes vital reforms that can be implemented tomorrow if our colleagues in the Senate take the bill up.

So why don't we do what is right for America? Why don't we come together and move the bill?

This wildfire season has been one of the worst in the last 10 years, and it has had enormous cost. Despite the cooler conditions in Montana, we have 35 fires that are continuing to burn, a total of 334,000 acres gone. That is equivalent to 522 miles, square miles. Two-thirds of this acreage belongs to the public, our national forests.

And it is not just the physical damage. We lost four firefighters in Washington, four that paid the sacrifice fighting forest fires, and we have to remember that.

I was at a fire in Glacier National Park. It was a reburn from a fire that occurred in 2003. The reburn happened to occur because of a threat of a lawsuit which prevented the Forest Service from doing the right thing. What they wanted to do was salvage timber. But because there was standing timber, ground crews couldn't get at it. And when ground crews couldn't get it, that means they had to fly aircraft at \$3,000 an hour to put out the fire. That is wrong. It is wrong for Montana, and it is wrong for America.

I know the firsthand value of our natural resources. I am a conservationist. But I also know the value of tourism in Montana. I also know the value of clean air. And when the smoke in Montana—which people travel all the way from across this country and

the world to go to—is worse than Beijing, it has an impact.

It also has an impact on the elderly, the asthmatic. It is unhealthy. Worst of all, it is preventable.

The problem is real. Not only does the Forest Service lack the resources to adequately fight fires, it has a land management problem at the source.

Former Chief of the Forest Service, Dale Bosworth, his quote before the hearing was: “We do not have a fire problem . . . we have a land management problem.”

This isn't from a political member. This is from a scientist. And yes, we need more scientists in the woods and less lawyers.

That is why I am proud of what we did in the House on H.R. 2647. We passed it back in July because we saw this problem coming, and so we crafted a solution. That is what we are all sent here to do. We were sent here for solutions, to look at the challenges ahead and make a difference.

So this bill addresses both the fire borrowing problem and the practices that have created the crisis that we now, unfortunately, have to bear. It does address lawsuits that are frivolous. The number one expense in the Forest Service is fighting forest fires, Number two is litigation, and if they have any money left, then that is what they use for management.

Why are we spending, this fire season, over \$600 million in August alone? Don't we all agree that \$600 million can be better utilized by preventing forest fires, by restoring habitat, by providing better public access, better recreational activities and opportunities on our public lands?

Unfortunately, we have lost this fire season, and still it burns.

Unfortunately, the Senate won't take up the bill. My fellow Montanan Senator STEVE DAINES has been a loud and vocal advocate of this bill. He understands, and I am asking his colleagues to stand and do the right thing: Take the bill up. If you don't like a provision in the bill, then show leadership and put an amendment on it and we will work together to fix it. That is what leadership does. But to sit there and not take up the bill and have no action is unacceptable.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that when we passed this bill in the House, we put amendments on it that were offered by Democrats. We were open. We listened. We wanted to do what is best for the forest.

I encourage the Senate to take up this bill. If there is something you don't like, let's talk about it. But let's do what is best for the forest. Let's make this bill the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

□ 1830

Mrs. LUMMIS. I join in thanking Representative WESTERMAN for this

legislation and this Special Order tonight, explaining the extent to which these catastrophic wildfires are destroying the West and other areas of our country.

This year, over 9 million acres have burned in the West. It is a new record for catastrophic wildfires. This year, most of the damage has been in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and northern California.

You heard the gentleman from northern California earlier talk about the number of houses that have been destroyed; the lives that have been disrupted; the wildlife that has been destroyed; the habitat that has been destroyed; the carbon that has gone up in the air and the illness that that has caused; the watersheds that are destroyed; the oxygen that is destroyed when you have ash running down hill-sides into streams, choking the oxygen out of the water, killing the fish.

The habitat destruction, the effects on people and ungulates and fish and resources, it is irresponsible. We have a stewardship obligation for these lands. We know how to manage these lands. This doesn't need to be happening.

Representative WESTERMAN is a professional forester and an engineer. He has spent his career studying the science of doing this right.

I have a photograph here of an example of how to do this right. He showed us some earlier from his State of Arkansas. I want to show you how his methodology works in the Black Hills that straddle the border between South Dakota and Wyoming.

You can't see this terribly clearly, but if you look at this vibrant green in the middle and compare it to the browns and yellows that you see down here—Black Hills National Forest—that has been thinned, that has been forested, that has been conservation logged.

It has created sunlight in places that were clogged and choked from sunlight. It has created healthy underbrush, as opposed to a clogged underbrush that burns. It has allowed wildlife to graze. It allows snow to be stored and held longer in the forest into the spring and very early summer before it melts and goes downstream, thereby preventing flooding downstream. It is a natural hedge against flooding.

We know all of this. All we have to do is pass and implement Representative WESTERMAN's bill, and we can start preventing this.

The day to save a tree is yesterday, but this summer, because we have ignored this problem for so long, we let 9 million more acres go up in smoke in the West.

I spent the entire August work period in my State of Wyoming. Although Wyoming, thank God, wasn't on fire this summer—it has been in the past—but I can tell you, every day, when I woke up on the western side of the State of Wyoming, my eyes were burning from fires that were burning hundreds of miles west of me in Idaho, in Oregon,

in Washington, and in northern California.

To ignore science, to ignore management practices, and to allow this to continue is abominable.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) has the answer. The House passed it. I urge the Senate to take it up.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his thoughtful contribution to the Congress of the United States by serving here.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for her comments, and I also thank her for pointing out that forest management is different in different parts of the country.

We have trained forestry professionals all over this country. We have good people working for the Forest Service that know how to do the right job, but their hands are tied. They can't use the things that they have learned in forestry school. They can't use the things that they have learned through practice. They can't practice the art of forestry and the science of forestry because of policy here in Washington, D.C.

We need to untie their hands so that they can implement these management procedures on the land to make it healthier.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Congressman WESTERMAN for organizing this Special Order tonight and for his indispensable work on the Natural Resources Committee and its Subcommittee on Federal Lands.

Mr. WESTERMAN is a professional forester, schooled at Yale University, which the founder of the U.S. Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot, did so much to shape.

Mr. WESTERMAN's H.R. 2647 represents the first step toward restoring the sound, well-established, scientifically validated, and time-tested methods that, for generations, produced healthy, thriving, and vibrant forests.

These forest management practices prevented vegetation and wildlife from overgrowing the ability of the land to support them. Not only did this assure robust and healthy forests capable of resisting fire, disease, and pestilence, but it also supported the prosperous economy.

Revenues from the sale of excess timber provided a steady stream of revenues to the Treasury which could, in turn, be used to further improve the public lands.

About 45 years ago, we replaced these sound management practices with what can only be described as a policy of benign neglect. In 1970, Congress adopted the National Environmental Policy Act that opened a floodgate of ponderous and Byzantine laws, regulations, and lawsuits, with the explicit promise that they would “save the environment.”

Well, after 45 years of these policies, I think we are entitled to ask: How is the environment doing?

Well, according to every scrap of evidence submitted to our subcommittee by a broad cross-section of experts, the answer is that these laws have not only failed to improve the forest environment; they have catastrophically harmed that environment.

Surplus timber harvested from our national forests as a result of these laws has dropped dramatically since the 1980s, while acreage destroyed by forest fire has increased concurrently and concomitantly. Wildlife habitats that were supposed to be preserved are now being incinerated.

Precipitation that once flowed to riparian habitats now evaporates in overgrown canopies or is quickly claimed in the fierce competition of densely packed vegetation. We have lost vast tracts of our national forests to beetle infestations, as weakened trees can no longer resist their attacks.

The U.S. Forest Service reports that in the Tahoe Basin in my district, there is now four times the vegetation density as normal, and trees that once had room to grow and thrive now fight for their lives against other trees trying to occupy the same ground.

Revenues that our forest management agencies once produced and that facilitated our forest stewardship have all but dried up. This has devastated mountain communities that once thrived from the forest economy, while precious resources are diverted for lifeline programs like secure rural schools and PILT.

Despite a growing population, visitation to our national forests has declined significantly. We can no longer manage lands to prevent fire or even salvage dead timber once fire has destroyed it.

Appeals, lawsuits, and especially the threat of lawsuits have paralyzed and demoralized the Forest Service and created perverse incentives to do nothing to manage our lands.

The steadily deteriorating situation is forcing managers to raid forest treatment and fire prevention funds to pay for the growing costs of wildfire suppression, creating a fiscal death spiral—the more we raid prevention funds, the more wildfires we have; the more wildfires we have, the more we have to raid our prevention funds.

Ironically, our private forest lands are today conspicuously healthier than the public lands, precisely because the private lands are free from so many of the laws that are tying the hands of our public foresters. These laws may be making environmental law firms rich, but they are killing our national forests.

H.R. 2647 is the first step toward restoring sound, rational, and scientific management of our national forests. It streamlines fire and disease prevention programs and assures that fire-killed timber can be quickly removed to create both the revenues and the room to restore fire-damaged lands. It protects forest managers from frivolous lawsuits.

In my district, comprising the Sierra Nevada mountains in California, two major forest fires are now raging. The Butte fire in Amador County has already killed two people, left hundreds homeless, and destroyed 72,000 acres of forest land. The Rough fire in Fresno County has destroyed 141,000 acres, and they are still burning tonight.

We have exhausted our firefighting budget, and, without relief, we will have to begin stripping funds intended for fire prevention.

Mr. WESTERMAN's bill would allow these catastrophic wildfires to be funded like every other natural disaster.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very simple choice. We can continue the misguided environmental laws that, for 45 years, have become responsible for the destruction of hundreds of square miles of our national forests every year, or we can restore the sound forest management practices that will guarantee healthy and resilient forests for the next generation.

This bill has already passed the House. It is now sitting in the Senate, and it is essential that the Senate act soon to put it on the President's desk.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from California and would also like to thank the gentleman for his tireless efforts on the Natural Resources Committee, the chairman of the Federal Lands Subcommittee.

This is something that—I am a freshman, and I have been working on for a small amount of time—but he has spent years working on this issue. I thank him for his tireless efforts and his desire to see healthy forests not only in his home State but across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes overlooked in the debate surrounding wildfires is the importance of forestry practices intended to prevent the wildfires before they start.

The Resilient Federal Forests Act, authored by my friend from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), passed the House in July with bipartisan support. Since then, there have been multiple fires, major fires that are raging across the country.

This bill would simplify and streamline environmental process requirements and reduce the cost of forest management projects intended to prevent catastrophic wildfires. The bill would also allow for quick removal of dead trees to pay for reforestation after large fires and prevent the incidence of reburn.

As wildfires continue to burn in the Western United States, with tremendous costs to people and property, it is important to note that these fires are literally sending billions of dollars of Federal assets up in smoke, depriving State government, local government, and the Federal Government of billions in revenues not just in wood products, but in recreation revenues.

I am a small forest owner myself. I understand the value of a healthy well-managed forest.

Mr. Speaker, America has already lost 9 million acres in valuable forests this year. Our forests continue to burn and more will be burned unless we act on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to quickly pass this much-needed legislation and send it to the President's desk.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. We are from Southern States, but good forestry management is very important to us as well. I have about 2.5 million acres of Federal forest in my district in Arkansas, and we want to see that land managed properly. We don't want to see it go up in smoke.

Mr. Speaker, we face a lot of contentious issues in this body and in Congress, but this shouldn't be one of them.

President Roosevelt, who was the father of our national forests, along with Gifford Pinchot, said that this is one of our most treasured natural resources. We need to leave it in better shape for the next generation than what we received it in.

Right now, we are not doing that. This is not a partisan issue. This is something that we need to look at the science, we need to work together, and we need to do what is right for America. We need to do what is right for forests because healthy forests create a winning situation on many levels.

We get better air quality. We get better water quality. We get a better economy. We get better wildlife habitat. We sequester more carbon.

□ 1845

There is not a downside to a healthy forest, but we have to get our act right here in Washington, D.C.

It is with that that I, again, plead with and encourage the Senate to take up this issue. Let's have a debate on it. Let's fix this and get ourselves back on the right path to healthy forests. We didn't get here overnight, and we are not going to fix everything overnight, but we have to start sometime. The sooner we start, the sooner we can have our forests back in a healthy condition and the sooner we can enjoy this national treasure that belongs to all of us in America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

VOTE "NO" TO DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about defunding Planned Parenthood. Some Republicans have made this such a priority that they are vowing to shut down our government, shut down our programs for veterans and hinder their ability to access services, WIC programs serving moms and babies, curtail services for domestic violence, and close our national parks and landmarks.

The last Republican shutdown cost our economy \$24 billion, but many of the GOP's Presidential candidates said in their debate just last night that defunding Planned Parenthood is a priority.

We are not talking about abortion here. We are talking about access to health care. Under current law, Federal money cannot be used for the coverage for abortion except in the most extreme circumstances of rape, incest, or the possibility of the death of the mother. Even though most Americans disagree with that restriction and believe firmly that decisions surrounding pregnancy should be between a woman, her doctor, and her faith, that is not the law of the land currently.

So if we are not talking about abortion, what are we talking about? What is this threat that will be stopped by cutting off all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood? What we are talking about is denying health care to the 2.7 million patients who received care just last year at Planned Parenthood.

More than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventative care. This includes wellness exams, cancer screenings, contraception, prenatal care, and testing and treatment for STIs. Just last year, Planned Parenthood had over 2 million contraception patients, performed approximately 3.7 million STI tests, 370,000 Pap tests, and 450,000 breast exams. These are the types of services patients receive at Planned Parenthood, and this preventive health care is what the majority would like to get rid of by defunding it.

That is what is most important about this debate: the care that patients receive, the care that one in five American women will receive from Planned Parenthood at some point in their life.

I would like to welcome my colleague, at this point, from New Jersey's 12th District, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN. She is a strong voice for women and families. I am proud to call her a friend and a colleague, and I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, for the umpteenth time, men in Congress are leading the charge to limit women's access to health care, but now, instead of just wasting taxpayer dollars and time, they plan to take their outrageous tactics to a whole new level, perhaps shutting down the entire Federal Government if they

don't get their way. As the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has already explained, that is absolutely ridiculous.

Rather than consider legislation that would fund repairs to our Nation's infrastructure or invest in our schools or create jobs for millions of Americans still out of work, we are considering legislation that would cut off support to an organization that provides vital health services to women and men who might not otherwise have access.

Mr. Speaker, Planned Parenthood is, first and foremost, an organization dedicated to women's health. What is more, despite the endless conservative rhetoric to the contrary, Planned Parenthood does not use a single dollar of Federal funds to provide abortions. This is really just a thinly veiled attempt to allow Congress to regulate a woman's uterus, and the end result won't be the end of very legal abortions. It will be the erosion of care, family planning, and medical treatment for thousands of women.

Wednesday's Washington Post offered a perfect example. It profiled a single Planned Parenthood clinic in Ohio, a clinic that does not offer abortion services. According to The Post, that clinic sees 7,100 patients each year, most of them young and poor. They administer 3,400 pregnancy tests, they write 2,900 birth control prescriptions, and they provide 13,200 screenings for sexually transmitted infections.

Facilities like this make up nearly half of the Planned Parenthood centers nationwide. Cutting their funding will only result in more illness, more unplanned pregnancies, and more babies born to mothers unprepared to care for them.

In 2013, Planned Parenthood provided more than 71,000 patients with care in my State, the State of New Jersey. They provided almost 16,000 Pap tests to New Jersey women, and they conducted more than 33,000 breast exams.

In a shortsighted response to a series of questionably edited videos and false claims, we are going to take health care away from Americans with few, if any, alternatives. That is not what my constituents elected me for. That is not what they expected me to be doing in Congress. I am here to create jobs, to better educate our young people, and to reform our broken criminal justice system. By no means am I here to relitigate a woman's right to choose.

Quite frankly, I am not sure which I am more disgusted by: the fact that we are doing this again, or the fact that I have come to the floor of this House so many times before to express that disgust.

I urge my colleagues to consider taking up the work that really matters to the American people. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

I want to reiterate something that the Congresswoman said, that this is

really a thinly veiled extremist position. What we are talking about is exactly as the gentlewoman from New Jersey put it. We are talking about relitigating rights that are established under the law and that have really nothing to do with abortion. They are having everything to do with the way that one in five American women receives her health care. And Planned Parenthood not only has a huge reach in the patients that they serve, but they historically serve low-income and underserved populations.

For example, in 2013, 78 percent of Planned Parenthood patients had incomes of 150 percent of poverty or less. To put that in real terms, that is an income of a little over \$36,000 dollars a year for a family of four. So not only does Planned Parenthood provide critical services to low-income families, but they also have a geographic reach to help ensure all patients have a healthcare access point.

Nationwide, they represent 54 percent of all health centers in rural areas, medically underserved areas, and health provider shortage areas. And in some areas, they are even a larger part of the healthcare system. In Alabama, Washington, D.C., Delaware, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Rhode Island, and Wyoming, they are 100 percent of the health centers in rural areas, medically underserved areas, and health provider shortage areas. That is why Planned Parenthood is so critical.

I am delighted to yield to my colleague from California's 33rd District. Congressman LIEU represents communities in Los Angeles. He is an Air Force veteran and Reservist, president of the freshman class of Democrats, and, as a California State senator, and now as a Congressman, he has had an unparalleled record on women's issues.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Thank you, Representative CLARK, for your great work on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise to stand with Planned Parenthood.

Last month, as it became more and more clear that Republicans were willing to shut down the Federal Government to defund Planned Parenthood, I received a letter from a constituent of mine in Los Angeles. She gave me permission to read her letter. It says:

Dear Congressman Lieu,

I grew up in a small desert town that had a very high teen pregnancy and high school dropout rate. I made very poor choices as a young teenager, and I was drinking, partying, and ditching school at 15. During this time, I met a boy I cared for and started having sex. I knew that I didn't want to end up pregnant like a lot of young girls in my town, so I went to the one place I knew would help: Planned Parenthood. They made me feel comfortable there. They performed a thorough exam and gave me birth control pills. They also contacted me confidentially to tell me I had an STD and would need to take antibiotics. Without treatment, this STD could have made me permanently infertile.

I thank God that I straightened my act out and, by the end of high school, I was getting

straight A's. I went to a good college, graduated from medical school, and began my residency. I met a great guy, who is now my husband, and again went to Planned Parenthood for birth control pills, STD screening, and Pap smears. Several years later, I finally went off the birth control pills, and my husband and I got pregnant with our first of two healthy children.

I feel compelled to share my story because of everything that Planned Parenthood has done for me in my lifetime. Planned Parenthood allowed me to make good, healthy reproductive decisions and avoid ever having to make a decision as to whether or not to abort an unwanted pregnancy.

That letter is from one of many constituents and from millions of women across America that have benefited from Planned Parenthood.

The two bills on the floor today that are attacking Planned Parenthood are a direct attack on American women. In reality, a vote to defund Planned Parenthood is a vote to deny health care, education, and opportunity to millions of Americans like my constituent.

I stand with American women and with Planned Parenthood in opposition to these two bills, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Thank you, Congressman LIEU. We appreciate your coming. The story that you shared is repeated over and over with the millions of women that count on Planned Parenthood for their healthcare services.

I would now like to yield to my colleague from Tennessee's Ninth District. Congressman COHEN is a champion on women's issues and a lifelong supporter of Planned Parenthood.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you very much for the time, and thank you for scheduling this important hour, Special Order.

Madam Speaker, this issue is extremely important to women, to men, to the Constitution, and to progress, and this week has been, unfortunately, very much an example of what the House has been doing throughout this session—messaging.

We are about to have a shutdown of government because of Planned Parenthood, and the cost to our economy and to people for a shutdown of the Federal Government is astronomical. The last shutdown, which I think was in 2013—it might have been 2011—cost hundreds of billions of dollars to the economy. The stock market fell, people lost jobs, lost income, and lost services all because of Planned Parenthood.

□ 1900

The bottom line is that Planned Parenthood is an outstanding organization that serves women in this Nation, in my State, and in my city—mostly low-income women and a lot of women of color.

There, they get their basic female healthcare services whether it is cervical cancer exams, breast cancer exams, sexually transmitted disease tests, family planning programs.

It is not about abortion. A very small part of it is abortion. It is not called

"Planned Abortion." It is called "Planned Parenthood."

Madam Speaker, most people are in need of those services. To cut them out, as they talked about, and to give them to community health centers is not the answer. That doesn't work as it is going to disadvantage a lot of women.

What we have had this week is a bill—the most recent bill—did anybody discuss the fact that this second bill didn't go to committee? I guess it is called the "unborn baby bill," whatever it is. Has that been discussed?

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. COHEN. That is the amazing thing. This bill that has come up—that will come up tomorrow, I guess—never went to committee. In fact, it was kind of just sprung on us on Monday, and they didn't even get the language straight until maybe Tuesday.

Madam Speaker, in the Congress, we generally have committee meetings. You have a hearing on a bill almost always—that is what committees are for, is to have hearings—sometimes by a subcommittee and then, later, by a full committee—and a markup, sometimes by the subcommittee, always at least by the full committee. Then it goes to the Rules Committee, and then it comes to the floor.

When this Congress came about, the majority party made a big deal about how they were going to come in and change the way things were done and how there was going to be regular order.

Bills weren't going to be brought to the floor without any notice; committees would do their work; amendments would be offered; and people would get an opportunity to testify from the public.

This bill was given no markup in committee, no hearing in committee, no opportunity for the public to voice any concerns as to whether they were for it or against it, and no Congresspeople on the committee had a chance to voice their concerns.

In essence, it was sprung on the public. The bill will have a new definition of "abortion"—unknown before in Federal law. That is a pretty major thing—with no hearing, no notice, no opportunity to address the issue, no opportunity to maybe bring in somebody who is an expert to say: You might have missed this. You might have missed that. This is the way it ought to be. No.

Madam Speaker, this week in Congress, the Republican side has basically said: We don't want to hear from the public. We don't want to hear from doctors. We don't want to hear from women. We don't want to hear from them on another bill we had up today. We don't want to hear from judges on something that affects the Federal courts, where the judges, in reviewing it, voted by 85 percent "bad idea"—no judges, no lawyers, no doctors, no women, no public—because that side of the House knows how to do everything.

They know how to define "abortion." They know how to run the courts. They know how to run women's lives. Choice and reproduction should be a decision between a woman, her family, her conscience, and her doctor, not what this side wants.

What this side wants is to repeal Roe v. Wade. They want to do away with a woman's right to abortion. That is what this is about. They pick these other issues to talk about, but that is what they really want. If that happens, it is going to be no different than alcohol prohibition in the twenties and marijuana today.

Alcohol was illegal. So what happened? People got alcohol and they drank, but they drank because organized crime supplied it for them—no taxes, lots of organized crime, lots of killings between organized crime.

Marijuana. Do people have problems getting marijuana? People don't have problems getting marijuana. It is everywhere. It was at George Bush's school. It is everywhere. It is not hard to get, but it gives the cartels a way to sell it. It happens.

Madam Speaker, when abortion was illegal in this country, wealthy women could afford to go to Mexico or wherever it was legal and get abortions. Poor people went to get abortions, but they had to go to somebody who maybe didn't have a clean area in which to do the procedure or the experience or the ability. Poor women went to back alleys and oftentimes had health detriments because of it and sometimes lost their lives.

So abortion is not going to be outlawed in this Congress, I don't think, but that is what they would like to do. Even if it is outlawed, it is still going to happen. If it happens, it is going to happen for the rich, and the poor are going to get the worst services.

You can't take your morality and tell the American public, when they want some service, some opportunity, some freedom, that they can't have it, because they will find it. It will just be through a roundabout way.

Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. CLARK for having this Special Order. I am going to always support Roe v. Wade and support Planned Parenthood. It does a lot for the women in my district. As I said, it is one of the best organizations in our country, and I believe that.

They help women with services they otherwise couldn't get. In a lot of States like mine, where the Affordable Care Act has not been extended through the expansion of Medicaid, it is even more difficult for poor women to get medical services and even life-saving services.

So thank you. We will continue to message and continue to fight and hope the American public realizes that what is going on here is shutting them out—no voice, no message—simply activity.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his words and for his commitment

to women and their access to health care and for pointing out the confounding thing about defunding Planned Parenthood, which is that we are not even talking about abortion, as we have already restricted that Federal funding.

Madam Speaker, we are talking about access to health care to underserved women, to low-income women, who are trying to get general wellness checkups, who are trying to have cancer screenings, who are trying to access health care.

It is Planned Parenthood that fills that void in our underserved populations, in our rural areas. That is where they make a critical difference.

You are absolutely right in that the messaging that this is somehow about something else is completely hiding the fact that we are bringing bills to the floor without committee hearings, that we are not being transparent, and that we are misleading the American public about what this debate is about.

I am delighted that we also have another champion for working families and a great voice for the communities he serves.

I yield to my colleague from California's 36th District, Congressman RUIZ.

Mr. RUIZ, I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a woman's right to choose, women's health, and Planned Parenthood.

You see, before I ran for Congress, I spent 9 years as an emergency medicine physician. A few years ago, a 55-year-old woman came into my emergency room with a gynecological hemorrhage.

After we stopped the bleeding in the ER, we admitted her for diagnosis and treatment. Sadly, as I suspected, she had advanced cervical cancer, and 5 months later, she died, leaving her family behind.

Until recently, cervical cancer was the leading cause of cancer deaths for women in the United States. However, over the past 40 years, we have dramatically reduced the number of deaths from cervical cancer.

According to the CDC, "This decline largely is the result of many women getting regular Pap tests, which can find cervical pre-cancer before it turns into cancer."

Madam Speaker, that is what is at stake in this debate.

In fact, 97 percent of Planned Parenthood's services are not abortion related. Planned Parenthood provides many health and wellness services, including STI testing, contraceptives, and cancer screenings to over 2 million women and men each year.

Opponents of Planned Parenthood's want to turn this into a debate about abortion, but it is not. Let's be clear. Defunding Planned Parenthood won't reduce the number of abortions at all.

This is a debate about cervical cancer. This is a debate about breast cancer. This is a debate about how many women we are going to allow to go

undiagnosed and untreated. This is a debate about how many women we are going to allow to show up in emergency rooms like mine, with terminal cancer, too late to be saved.

In California alone, Planned Parenthood health centers have provided over 93,000 Pap tests for cervical cancer and 97,000 breast exams to help prevent death from breast cancer.

Madam Speaker, Planned Parenthood saves lives.

Here is who actually loses if Planned Parenthood loses its funding: Women in geographically underserved areas lose; uninsured and underinsured women lose; women on Medicaid lose; and low-income women lose.

Planned Parenthood fills that access gap and provides essential health services to those who need it the most. Cutting their funding will have a long-term, devastating effect on the overall health of women in our communities, worsening health outcomes and health disparities for women across our Nation.

To me, this isn't a political debate, because I have seen firsthand what happens when women don't have access to preventative care. Women die; children are left without their mothers; and families are torn apart.

It is for these reasons that I oppose this misguided, mean-spirited, politically driven measure, and it is for these reasons that I stand with Planned Parenthood.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from California for sharing his experience as a medical doctor and as someone who stands with Planned Parenthood.

Thank you for joining us.

Congressman RUIZ raises an interesting point about looking at our system of health care.

Part of the proposal from the Republicans is that this is easy, that we can simply take the money from Planned Parenthood and give it to community health centers, but there is simply not the capacity in the system to handle these extra patients.

Currently, more than half of Medicaid providers are not offering appointments to new Medicaid patients, but two-thirds of the States report difficulty in ensuring enough providers, including OB/GYN care.

Madam Speaker, this hurts low-income women especially hard because 60 percent of Planned Parenthood patients access care through Medicaid and/or Title X, and 35 percent of women view their OB/GYN as their main source of care.

So what we are talking about here is not abortion, but women's health care, preventative measures that save lives.

We know that over 90 percent of the services Planned Parenthood provides are preventative. We know that they serve underserved areas.

We know that there isn't enough capacity to see these patients in other settings and that eliminating funding for Planned Parenthood would mean

over 390,000 patients would no longer receive health care.

If all of this sounds crazy to you, you are not alone. It is why I came down here tonight, and I thank my colleagues who joined me.

It is time that we reveal the falsehoods of this argument and defeat these efforts—these radical efforts—that are threatening to shut down our government in order to defund Planned Parenthood, which carries so much of our healthcare system for women in this country and especially for low-income women.

It is time we stand up, debunk the lies and the mysteries that we are being told, and let women have the healthcare access that they need and deserve.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 719. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1090. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1580. An act to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1090. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1580. An act to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 18, 2015, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 114th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

DARIN LAHOOD, Eighteenth District of Illinois.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2803. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two United States Navy officers, Captain Shoshana S. Chatfield and Captain Cathal S. O'Connor, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2804. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-2015-0070 RCRA; FRL-9933-79-Region 6] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2805. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Kansas Regional Haze State Implementation Plan Revision and 2014 Five-Year Progress Report [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0299; FRL-9933-84-Region 7] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2806. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of NOx Emissions From Large Stationary Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0520; FRL-9934-00-Region 7] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2807. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Sec. 804 of the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 [Title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246)], and Secs. 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107-228); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2808. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2017 budget request for the Office of Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, in accordance with Sec. 7(f) of the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2809. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [SATS No.: PA-159-FOR; Docket No.: OSM-2010-0017; SID1S SS08011000 SX064A000 156S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A000 15XS501520] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2810. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XE023) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2811. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD996) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2812. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2015 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications [Docket No.: 150126074-5655-02] (RIN: 0648-XD742) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2813. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Swordfish Drift Gillnet Fishery; Vessel Monitoring System Requirements [Docket No.: 140528460-5498-03] (RIN: 0648-BE25) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2814. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern

United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 150105004-5355-01] (RIN: 0648-XE073) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2815. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 130717632-4285-02] (RIN: 0648-XE085) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2816. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 8; Correction [Docket No.: 140214145-5582-02] (RIN: 0648-BD81) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2817. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels [Docket No.: 141125999-5362-02] (RIN: 0648-XE084) received September 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2818. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120328229-4949-02] (RIN: 0648-XE079) received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2819. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations. Areas of the National Park System, Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, Off-Road Motor Vehicles [NPS-LAMR-18708; PPWONRADE2, PMP00E105.YP0000] (RIN: 1024-AD86) received September 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2820. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Departmental Cases Hearings Division, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hearing Process Concerning Acknowledgement of American Indian Tribes [156A2100DD/AAKC001030/A0A501010.999900 253G] (RIN: 1094-AA54) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2821. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Cleveland National Air Show; Lake Erie and

Cleveland Harbor, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0718] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2822. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's temporary rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0282; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-168-AD; Amendment 39-18242; AD 2015-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2823. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0282; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-168-AD; Amendment 39-18242; AD 2015-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2824. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; REIMS AVIATION S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3398; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-18232; AD 2015-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2825. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3325; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-15] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2826. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kelso, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1133; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-8] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2827. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0364; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-18234; AD 2015-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2828. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Restricted Areas R-3804A, R-3804B, and R-3804C; Fort Polk, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0639; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2829. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E

Airspace; Toledo, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1135; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-9] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2830. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1481; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-1] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2831. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways; Northeastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1650; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AEA-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2832. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0643; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-059-AD; Amendment 39-18235; AD 2015-17-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2833. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0492; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-232-AD; Amendment 39-18237; AD 2015-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2834. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class D Airspace; Ogden, Hill AFB, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0691; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-6] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2835. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Ogden-Hinckley Airport, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0671; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-5] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2836. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31032; Amdt. No.: 3656] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2837. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31031; Amdt. No.: 3655] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2838. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Integrated Hedging Transactions of Qualifying Debt [TD 9736] (RIN: 1545-BK98) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2839. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting notification of the President's ongoing negotiations in the World Trade Organization aimed at eliminating tariffs on a wide range of environmental goods, in accordance with Sec. 107(b)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (Trade Priorities Act of 2015); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2840. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's temporary regulations — Administration of Multiemployer Plan Participant Vote on an Approved Suspension of Benefits Under MPRA [TD 9735] (RIN: 1545-BM89) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2841. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — United States Property Held by Controlled Foreign Corporations in Transactions Involving Partnerships; Rents and Royalties Derived in the Active Conduct of a Trade or Business [TD 9733] (RIN: 1545-BJ49) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2842. A letter from the Chairman and Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2015 report for the FY ending September 30, 2014, pursuant to Sec. 7(b)(6) of the Railroad Retirement Act and Sec. 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3531. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to include claims relating to a response under the Comprehensive Response, Compensation, and Liability Act among those claims for which the Federal Tort Claims Act provides a remedy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 3532. A bill to amend the fresh fruit and vegetable program under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to include canned, dried, frozen, or pureed fruits

and vegetables; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 3533. A bill to reduce Federal, State, and local costs of providing high-quality drinking water to millions of people in the United States residing in rural communities by facilitating greater use of cost-effective alternative systems, including well water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 3534. A bill to reduce the national debt and eliminate waste in Government spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3535. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs; to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 3536. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe a motor vehicle safety standard requiring commercial motor vehicles to be equipped with a forward collision avoidance and mitigation braking system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KATKO, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 3537. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues are to be regulated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 3538. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to maintain and operate at least one Doppler weather radar site within 55 miles of each city in the United States that has a population of more than 700,000 individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAUL-

SEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for clinical testing expenses for qualified infectious disease drugs and rapid diagnostic tests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3540. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to make improvements to the food safety education program carried out under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 3541. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to modify the goals of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3542. A bill to provide support for pre-kindergarten education through an Early Education Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3543. A bill to improve Federal sentencing and corrections practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 3544. A bill to help keep law enforcement officers and communities safer by making grants to purchase body worn cameras for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3545. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for replacement costs associated with certain imported corrosive drywall, and to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to allow use of community development block grant amounts for repairs to housing constructed using such corrosive drywall, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr.

UPTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 3546. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 3547. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a task force on Agent Orange exposure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 3548. A bill to increase transparency of agencies by requiring a report describing any proposed conference; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 3549. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive the requirement of certain veterans to make copayments for hospital care and medical services in the case of an error by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 3550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3551. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equitable treatment for residents of Puerto Rico with respect to the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3554. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to create a pilot program to award grants to units of general local government and community-based organizations to create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr.

GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 3555. A bill to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. CURELO of Florida, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H. Res. 424. A resolution expressing the commitment of the House of Representatives to conservative environmental stewardship; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MULLIN):

H. Res. 425. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2015 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIREN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FARR, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 426. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HOYER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD,

Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 427. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Congressman Louis Stokes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 428. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to protect House employees from employment discrimination on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender identity; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. GRAHAM):

H. Res. 429. A resolution congratulating Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver on their graduation from Ranger School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 empowers Congress to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 3534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which states: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 3538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution and Amendment XVI of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 3544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have the power. . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes:"

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 3549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation provides the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the authority to waive a co-payment requirement if the Department of Veterans Affairs is the cause of an error that delays sending a bill to a veteran. Additionally, the bill requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to notify a veteran of how to get a waiver and establish a payment plan before they can collect payment when they does not bill a veteran in a timely manner. Specific authority is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support Armies; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to lay and collect taxes and to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regula-

tions respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to lay and collect taxes and to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 167: Mr. YODER and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 169: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 205: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 206: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 213: Mrs. LOVE, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 242: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 244: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 267: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 270: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 344: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 390: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 483: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 546: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 581: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 592: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 600: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 604: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 664: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 702: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 733: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 765: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 767: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 775: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 793: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 814: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 815: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 863: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 868: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 885: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 921: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 927: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 928: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 985: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1061: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1145: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1150: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1151: Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1153: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1202: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1211: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1218: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1232: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1258: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1270: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILL, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1292: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1338: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1343: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1369: Mr. FLORES and Mr. LUETKE-MEYER.
H.R. 1399: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1401: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1413: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1428: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1475: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1519: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1528: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1550: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1559: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1566: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1567: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SHIM-KUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1588: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1604: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1610: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1624: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1671: Mr. BYRNE and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1683: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1706: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1715: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1736: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1784: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1786: Mr. WALZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 1859: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1893: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 1901: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1938: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1988: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2014: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2030: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2050: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2083: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2087: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2096: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2205: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2255: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2260: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2264: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2280: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2313: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2320: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2342: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COOK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2355: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2391: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2403: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2442: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2519: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2567: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2611: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2622: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2640: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2657: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2671: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2672: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2673: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2674: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2713: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2715: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2764: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2775: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. POSTER.

H.R. 2799: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2805: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2849: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2858: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2867: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2878: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2903: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2905: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2911: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. REED, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2915: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2920: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2940: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 2948: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3011: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3016: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3024: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3036: Mr. KATKO, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3040: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3041: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3065: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3081: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3084: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3110: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3126: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 3134: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3136: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3166: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3177: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 3183: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 3189: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3220: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 3221: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3222: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3248: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 3268: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3285: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3286: Mr. NUNES and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3309: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3314: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3338: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 3339: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3340: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3355: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3363: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3371: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3411: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3423: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3427: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3439: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3442: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3443: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 3457: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3473: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3476: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 3477: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3495: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3504: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3511: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3516: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3517: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 3521: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3523: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. SANFORD.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. ASHFORD.
H. Con. Res. 17: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. PETERSON.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JOHNSON

of Ohio, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 12: Mr. HIMES and Mr. AMODEI.
H. Res. 82: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 112: Ms. EDWARDS.
H. Res. 139: Mr. KLINE.
H. Res. 230: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H. Res. 277: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. SALMON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 289: Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 293: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TROTT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 294: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 383: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 385: Mr. GOHMERT.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

26. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gregory D. Watson of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to propose, for ratification by special conventions held within the individual states, an amendment to the United States Constitution which would clarify that any agreement arrived at between the President of the United States and any foreign government or governments constitutes a "treaty" thereby necessitating a two-thirds affirmative vote of "concurrence" by the United States Senate as provided in Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.